AN

ENGLISH GRAMMAR:

COMPREHENDING

THE PRINCIPLES AND RULES

OF THE

LANGUAGE,

ILLUSTRATED BY

APPROPRIATE EXERCISES,

AND

A KEY TO THE EXERCISES.

BY LINDLEY MURRAY.

"They who are learning to compose and arrange their sentences with accuracy and "order, are learning, at the same time, to think with accuracy and order."....BLAIR.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.

THE THIRD EDITION,

CORRECTED, AND MUCH ENLARGED.

THE TANJORE MAHARAJA SERFOJI'S SARASWATI MAHAL.

York:

Printed by Thomas Wilson & Sons, High-Ousegate,

FOR LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN; AND DARTON AND HARVEY, LONDON: AND FOR WILSON AND SONS, YORK.

1816.

PREFACE.

THE author of these volumes made a number of improvements in the last *Duodecimo* edition of his Grammar; and inserted many critical and explanatory notes, in subsequent editions of the Exercises and the Key; and added, at the end of the Key, a copious Alphabetical Index to all the three books. In consequence of these additions and variations, the proprietors of the works conceived that an improved edition of the whole, in two volumes *Octavo*, in a large letter, and on superfine paper, with an appropriate title, would not be unacceptable to the public. The author has therefore embraced this opportunity, to revise the Grammar, to enlarge it very considerably,

and to adapt the whole to the purposes in view *.

In its present form, the work is designed for the use of persons, who may think it merits a place in their Libraries. To this privilege it may, perhaps, be allowed to aspire, as a work containing an ample exhibition of the principles of English Grammar, and a copious illustration of those principles; with the addition of some positions and discussions, which the author persuades himself are not destitute of originality. It may therefore serve as a book of reference, to refresh the memory, and, in some degree, to employ the curiosity, of persons who are skilled in grammar, as well as to extend the knowledge of those who wish to improve themselves in the art.

In preparing for the *Octavo* edition, the author examined the most respectable publications on

---

* The additions occupy more than *Ninety pages* of the first volume; and are interspersed throughout the book.

the subject of grammar, that had recently appeared; and he has, in consequence, been the better enabled to extend and improve his work. These improvements consist chiefly of a number of observations, calculated to illustrate and confirm particular rules and positions contained in the Grammar; and of many critical discussions, in justification of some of its parts, against which objections had been advanced. These discussions are not of small importance, nor of a merely speculative nature. They respect some of the established principles and arrangements of the language. And the author presumes, that whilst they support these principles, they will be found to contain some views and constructions, which the reader may usefully apply to a variety of other occasions.

It may not be improper to observe, that the Grammar, Exercises, and Key, in their common form, and at their usual prices, will continue to be sold, separately or together, for the use of schools and private learners.

If any persons should be inclined to think, that this work would have been more satisfactory to readers in general, had the first volume been published separately, and the Exercises and Key omitted; the author takes the liberty of suggesting to them, how very imperfect the performance would have been, and how liable to objection, if it had appeared in so detached and partial a manner. The Exercises and the Key are necessary appendages to the principles of grammar; and serve, not only to illustrate and enforce, but to vary and extend, the grammatical rules and positions. Many parts of the second volume are as particularly calculated, for the improvement of persons far advanced in the study of the language, as other parts of it are, for the instruction of those who have made but little progress in the grammatical art. The two volumes are, indeed, intimately connected, and constitute one uniform system of English Grammar.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE DUODECIMO EDITION*.

WHEN the number and variety of English Grammars already published, and the ability with which some of them are written, are considered, little can be expected from a new compilation, besides a careful selection of the most useful matter, and some degree of improvement in the mode of adapting it to the understanding, and the gradual progress of learners. In these respects something, perhaps, may yet be done, for the ease and advantage of young persons.

IN books designed for the instruction of youth, there is a medium to be observed, between treating the subject in so extensive and minute a manner, as to embarrass

* As the Introduction to the Duodecimo edition of the Grammar, contains some views and explanations of the subject, which may be useful to readers in general, as well as to young students, it is thought proper to retain it in this edition of the work.

and confuse their minds, by offering too much at once for their comprehension; and, on the other hand, conducting it by such short and general precepts and observations, as convey to them no clear and precise information. A distribution of the parts, which is either defective or irregular, has also a tendency to perplex the young understanding, and to retard its knowledge of the principles of literature. A distinct general view, or outline, of all the essential parts of the study in which they are engaged; a gradual and judicious supply of this outline; and a due arrangement of the divisions, according to their natural order and connexion, appear to be among the best means of enlightening the minds of youth, and of facilitating their acquisition of knowledge. The author of this work, at the same time that he has endeavoured to avoid a plan, which may be too concise or too extensive, defective in its parts or irregular in the disposition of them, has studied to render his subject sufficiently easy, intelligible, and comprehensive. He does not presume to have completely attained these objects. How far he has succeeded in the attempt, and wherein he has failed, must be referred to the determination of the judicious and candid reader.

THE method which he has adopted, of exhibiting the performance in characters of different sizes, will, he trusts, be conducive to that gradual and regular procedure, which is so favourable to the business of instruction. The more important rules, definitions, and observations, and which are therefore the most proper to be committed to memory, are printed with a larger type;

whilst rules and remarks that are of less consequence, that extend or diversify the general idea, or that serve as explanations, are contained in the smaller letter: these, or the chief of them, will be perused by the student to the greatest advantage, if postponed till the general system be completed. The use of notes and observations, in the common and detached manner, at the bottom of the page, would not, it is imagined, be so likely to attract the perusal of youth, or admit of so ample and regular an illustration, as a continued and uniform order of the several subjects. In adopting this mode, care has been taken to adjust it so that the whole may be perused in a connected progress, or the part contained in the larger character read in order by itself. Many of the notes and observations are intended, not only to explain the subjects, and to illustrate them, by comparative views of the grammar of other languages, and of the various sentiments of English grammarians; but also to invite the ingenious student to inquiry and reflection, and prompt him to a more enlarged, critical, and philosophical research.

With respect to the definitions and rules, it may not be improper more particularly to observe, that in selecting and forming them, it has been the author's aim to render them as exact and comprehensive, and, at the same time, as intelligible to young minds, as the nature of the subject, and the difficulties attending it, would admit. He presumes that they are also calculated to be readily committed to memory, and easily retained. For this purpose, he has been solicitous to select terms that are smooth and voluble; to proportion the members of

the sentences to one another; to avoid protracted periods; and to give the whole definition or rule, as much harmony of expression as he could devise.

From the sentiment generally admitted, that a proper selection of faulty composition is more instructive to the young grammarian, than any rules and examples of propriety that can be given, the Compiler has been induced to pay peculiar attention to this part of the subject; and though the instances of false grammar, under the rules of Syntax, are numerous, it is hoped they will not be found too many, when their variety and usefulness are considered.

In a work which professes itself to be a compilation, and which, from the nature and design of it, must consist chiefly of materials selected from the writings of others, it is scarcely necessary to apologize for the use which the Compiler has made of his predecessors' labours; or for omitting to insert their names. From the alterations which have been frequently made in the sentiments and the language, to suit the connexion, and to adapt them to the particular purposes for which they are introduced; and, in many instances, from the uncertainty to whom the passages originally belonged, the insertion of names could seldom be made with propriety. But if this could have been generally done, a work of this nature would derive no advantage from it, equal to the inconvenience of crowding the pages with a repetition of names and references. It is, however, proper to acknowledge, in general terms, that the authors to whom the grammatical part of this compilation is principally in-

debted for its materials, are Harris, Johnson, Lowth, Priestley, Beattie, Sheridan, Walker, and Coote.

The Rules and Observations respecting Perspicuity and Accuracy of expression, contained in the Appendix, and which are, chiefly, extracted from the writings of Blair and Campbell, will, it is presumed, form a proper addition to the Grammar. The subjects are very nearly related; and the study of perspicuity and accuracy in writing, appears naturally to follow that of Grammar. A competent acquaintance with the principles of both, will prepare and qualify the students, for prosecuting those additional improvements in language, to which they may be properly directed.

On the utility and importance of the study of Grammar, and the principles of Composition, much might be advanced, for the encouragement of persons in early life to apply themselves to this branch of learning; but as the limits of this Introduction will not allow of many observations on the subject, a few leading sentiments are all that can be admitted here with propriety. As words are the signs of our ideas, and the medium by which we perceive the sentiments of others, and communicate our own; and as signs exhibit the things which they are intended to represent, more or less accurately, according as their real or established conformity to those things is more or less exact; it is evident, that in proportion to our knowledge of the nature and properties of words, of their relation to each other, and of their established connexion with the ideas to which they are applied, will be

the certainty and ease, with which we transfuse our sentiments into the minds of one another; and that, without a competent knowledge of this kind, we shall frequently be in hazard of misunderstanding others, and of being misunderstood ourselves. It may indeed be justly asserted, that many of the differences in opinion amongst men, with the disputes, contentions, and alienations of heart, which have too often proceeded from such differences, have been occasioned by a want of proper skill in the connexion and meaning of words, and by a tenacious misapplication of language.

One of the best supports, which the recommendation of this study can receive, in small compass, may be derived from the following sentiments of an eminent and candid writer on language and composition: "All that regards the study of composition, merits the higher attention upon this account, that it is intimately connected with the improvement of our intellectual powers. For I must be allowed to say, that when we are employed, after a proper manner, in the study of composition, we are cultivating the understanding itself. The study of arranging and expressing our thoughts with propriety, teaches to think, as well as to speak, accurately."*

Before the close of this Introduction, it may not be superfluous to observe, that the author of the following work has no interest in it, but that which arises from the hope, that it will prove of some advantage to young per-

* Dr. Blair.

sons, and relieve the labours of those who are employed in their education. He wishes to promote, in some degree, the cause of virtue, as well as of learning; and, with this view, he has been studious, through the whole of the work, not only to avoid every example and illustration, which might have an improper effect on the minds of youth; but also to introduce, on many occasions, such as have a moral and religious tendency. His attention to objects of so much importance will, he trusts, meet the approbation of every well-disposed reader. If they were faithfully regarded in all books of education, they would doubtless contribute very materially to the order and happiness of society, by guarding the innocence, and cherishing the virtue, of the rising generation.

Holdgate, near York,—1795.

Advertisement

TO THE NINTH DUODECIMO EDITION.

THE eighth edition of this grammar received considerable alterations and additions: but works of this nature admit of repeated improvements; and are, perhaps, never complete. The author, solicitous to render his book more worthy of the encouraging approbation bestowed on it by the public, has again revised the work with care and attention. The new edition, he hopes, will be found much improved. The additions, which are very considerable, are, chiefly such as are calculated, to expand the learner's views of the subject; to obviate objections; and to render the study of grammar both easy and interesting. This edition contains also a new and enlarged system of parsing; copious lists of nouns arranged according to their gender and number; and many notes and observations, which serve to extend, or to explain, particular rules and positions*.

THE writer is sensible that, after all his endeavours to elucidate the principles of the work, there are few of

* The author conceives that the occasional strictures, dispersed through the book, and intended to illustrate and support a number of important grammatical points, will not, to young persons of ingenuity, appear to be dry and useless discussions. He is persuaded that, by such persons, they will be read with attention. And he presumes that these strictures will gratify their curiosity, stimulate application, and give solidity and permanence to their grammatical knowledge.

the divisions, arrangements, definitions, or rules, against which critical ingenuity cannot devise plausible objections. The subject is attended with so much intricacy, and admits of views so various, that it was not possible to render every part of it unexceptionable; or to accommodate the work, in all respects, to the opinions and prepossessions of every grammarian and teacher. If the author has adopted that system which, on the whole, is best suited to the nature of the subject, and conformable to the sentiments of the most judicious grammarians; if his reasonings and illustrations, respecting particular points, are founded on just principles, and the peculiarities of the English language; he has, perhaps, done all that could reasonably be expected in a work of this nature; and he may warrantably indulge a hope, that the book will be still more extensively approved and circulated.

Holdgate, near York,—1804.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

ORTHOGRAPHY.

CHAP. 1. Of letters. Page.

SECT. 1. Of the letters, of language, and a perfect alphabet 26

2. General observations on the sounds of the letters 36

3. Of the organs of articulation 49

CHAP. 2. Of syllables, and the rules for arranging them 52

CHAP. 3. Of words in general, and the rules for spelling them 55

PART II.

ETYMOLOGY.

CHAP. 1. A general view of the parts of speech 61

CHAP. 2. Of the articles 67

Page.

CHAP. 3. Of substantives.

SECT. 1. Of substantives in general 75
2. Of gender 76
3. Of number 80
4. Of case 83

CHAP. 4. Of adjectives.

SECT. 1. Of the nature of adjectives, and the degrees of comparison 88
2. Remarks on the subject of comparison 90

CHAP. 5. Of pronouns.

SECT. 1. Of the personal pronouns 94
2. Of relative pronouns 97
3. Of the adjective pronouns 100

CHAP. 6 Of verbs.

SECT. 1. Of the nature of verbs in general 107
2. Of number and person 111
3. Of moods and participles 112
4. Remarks on the potential mood 117
5. Of the tenses 119
6. The conjugation of the auxiliary verbs *to have* and *to be* 131
7. The auxiliary verbs conjugated in their simple form; with observations on their peculiar nature and force 141
8. The conjugation of regular verbs 147

Page.

SECT. 9. Observations on passive verbs 159
10. Of irregular verbs 162
11. Of defective verbs; and of the different ways in which verbs are conjugated 168
12. Theory respecting the inflections of language 172

CHAP. 7. Of adverbs 177
CHAP. 8. Of prepositions 181
CHAP. 9. Of conjunctions 189
CHAP. 10. Of interjections 197
CHAP. 11. Of derivation.

SECT. 1. Of the various ways in which words are derived from one another 199
2. A sketch of the steps, by which the English language has risen to its present state of refinement 208

CHAP. 12. Number and variety of words, &c. 211

PART III.

SYNTAX. 215

Of the syntax of the article 254
Of the syntax of the noun.

Of several nouns joined by copulatives 225
Of nouns connected by disjunctives 229

Page.
Of nouns of multitude 230
Of one noun governing another in the possessive case 259

Of the syntax of the pronoun.

Of pronouns agreeing with their antecedents 232
Of the relative being nominative to the verb 239
Of the relative preceded by nominatives of different persons 241

Of the syntax of the adjective 242, 254
Of the syntax of the verb.

Of the verb's agreement with the nominative case 218
Of verbs active requiring the objective case 267
Of one verb governing another in the infinitive mood ... 272
Of verbs and words related in point of time 274

Of the syntax of the participle 285
Of the rules respecting adverbs.

Of the position of adverbs 290
Of two negatives 293

Of the syntax of prepositions .... 294—300
Of the syntax of conjunctions.

Of conjunctions connecting the same moods, tenses, and cases 301
Of conjunctions requiring the subjunctive mood, &c. .... 303—311

Of the syntax of interjections 330
Of comparisons by the conjunction *than* or *as* 315

Page.
Directions respecting the ellipsis 319
General rule of syntax 326
Directions for parsing .... 331—344

PART IV.

Prosody.

CHAP. 1. Of pronunciation 345
SECT. 1. Of accent 345
2. Of quantity 351
3. Of emphasis 355
4. Of pauses 364
5. Of tones 367
CHAP. 2. Of versification 370

Of Punctuation.

CHAP. 1. Of the comma 392
CHAP. 2. Of the semicolon 402
CHAP. 3. Of the colon 403
CHAP. 4. Of the period 405
CHAP. 5. Of the dash, notes of interrogation and exclamation, and the parenthesis 406
CHAP. 6. Of the apostrophe, caret, &c. 411
CHAP. 7. Directions respecting capital letters 414
CHAP. 8. Of paragraphs 416

VINDICATION OF THE STUDY OF GRAMMAR 420

APPENDIX.

RULES AND OBSERVATIONS FOR PROMOTING PERSPICUITY AND ACCURACY IN WRITING.

PART I.

Of perspicuity and accuracy of expression, with respect to single words and phrases.

Page.
CHAP. 1. Of purity 428
CHAP. 2. Of propriety 429
CHAP. 3. Of precision 438

PART II.

Of perspicuity and accuracy of expression, with respect to the construction of sentences.

CHAP. 1. Of the clearness of a sentence 445
CHAP. 2. Of the unity of a sentence 452
CHAP. 3. Of the strength of a sentence 459
CHAP. 4. Of figures of speech 486

PART III.

Of perspicuity and accuracy of expression, with respect to the great principle which, on all occasions, decides the propriety of language.

CHAP. 1. The nature and characters of the use which gives law to language 520

SECT. 1. Of reputable use 521
SECT. 2. Of national use 524
SECT. 3. Of present use 526

CHAP. 2. The nature and use of verbal criticism, with its principal canons 531

SECT. 1. Good use not always uniform in her decisions 532
SECT. 2. Every thing favoured by good use, not on that account worthy to be retained 535

ADDRESS TO YOUNG STUDENTS 539

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE THIRD OCTAVO EDITION.

THE improvements contained in the THIRD EDITION of the OCTAVO grammar, consist of many corrections and alterations of particular passages, in the first volume, and of more than *forty pages* of additional matter, dispersed in various parts of it: and also of a considerable modification of the first part of the second volume; namely, the Exercises which respect the nature and principles of Parsing. The last section under the head of Parsing, contains a large number of recent exercises on some of the more difficult rules of grammar: and they are exhibited in a peculiar form, calculated to give the student a radical and satisfactory view of those rules.

The author indulges a hope, that these enlargements and variations will meet the approbation of

the judicious reader; and render the new edition, what he has sedulously endeavoured to make it, a material improvement of the work.

He also ventures to presume, that the numerous exemplifications, of a moral and improving nature, with which all the editions of the work are interspersed; and the short subsidiary disquisitions of the present edition, as well as those of former impressions; will afford some relief to the subject of grammar, and render it less dry and uninteresting to the student. Perhaps they will be found to contribute, in some degree, to invite and encourage him to acquire an art, which, in its own nature, does not, to young minds especially, present many attractions.

Holdgate, near York,—1816.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

English grammar is the art of speaking and writing the English language with propriety....It is divided into four parts, viz.

1. ORTHOGRAPHY, 3. SYNTAX, and
2. ETYMOLOGY, 4. PROSODY.

This division may be rendered more intelligible to the student, by observing, in other words, that Grammar treats,

First, of the form and sound of the letters, the combination of letters into syllables, and syllables into words;

Secondly, of the different sorts of words, their various modifications, and their derivation;

Thirdly, of the union and right order of words in the formation of a sentence; and

Lastly, of the just pronunciation, and poetical construction of sentences.

Grammar may be considered as consisting of two species, *Universal* and *Particular*. Grammar in general, or Universal Grammar, explains the principles which are common to all languages. Particular Grammar applies those general principles to a particular language, modifying them according to the genius of that tongue, and the established practice of the best speakers and writers by whom it is used.

PART I.

ORTHOGRAPHY.

CHAPTER I.

Of the Letters.

Section 1.

Of the letters—of language—and of a perfect alphabet.

Orthography teaches the nature and powers of letters, and the just method of spelling words.

A letter is the first principle, or least part, of a word.

The letters of the English language, called the English Alphabet, are twenty six in number.

These letters are the representatives of certain articulate sounds, the elements of the language. An articulate sound, is the sound of the human voice, formed by the organs of speech.

"Language, in the proper sense of the word, signifies the expression of our ideas, and their various relations, by certain articulate sounds, which are used as the signs of those ideas and relations. The faculty of speech is one of the distinguishing characters of our nature; none of the inferior animals being in any degree possessed of it. For we must not call by the name of *speech* that imitation of human articulate voice, which parrots and some other birds are capable of: speech implying thought, and consciousness, and the power of separating and arranging our ideas, which are faculties peculiar to rational minds.

That some inferior animals should be able to mimic human articulation, will not seem wonderful, when we recollect, that even by machines certain words have been expressed in this manner. But that the parrot should annex thought to the word he utters, is scarcely more probable, than that a machine should do so. *Rogue* and *knave* are in every parrot's mouth: but the ideas they stand for, are incomprehensible by any other beings, than those endued with reason and a moral faculty.

It has however been a common opinion, and it is sufficiently probable, that, among irrational animals, there is something which, by a *figure*, we may call *Language*, as the instinctive economy of bees is figuratively called *Government*. This at least is evident, that the natural voices of one animal are, in some degree, intelligible, or convey particular feelings, or impulses, to others of the same species. But these, and other animal voices that might be mentioned, have no analogy with human speech.—For, *first*, men speak by art and imitation, whereas the voices in question are wholly instinctive. That a dog, which had never heard another bark, would notwithstanding bark himself, admits of no doubt: and that a man, who had never heard any language, would not speak any, is equally certain. *Secondly*, the voices of brute animals are not broken, or resolvable, into distinct elementary sounds, like those of man when he speaks; nor are they susceptible of that variety, which would be necessary for the communication of a very few sentiments: and it is pretty certain, that, previously to instruction, the young animals comprehend their meaning, as well as the old ones. *Thirdly*, these voices seem intended by nature to express, not distinct ideas, but such feelings only, as it may be for the good of the species, or for the advantage of man, that they should have the power of uttering: in which, as in all other respects, they are analogous, not to our speaking; but to our weeping,

laughing, groaning, screaming, and other natural and audible expressions of appetite and passion."

Buffon, in his account of the Ouran-Outang, says, "The tongue, and all the organs of the voice, are similar to those of men, and yet the animal cannot articulate; the brain is formed in the same manner as that of man, and yet the creature wants reason: an evident proof that the parts of the body, how nicely soever formed, are formed to very limited ends, when there is not infused a rational soul to direct their operations."

The following is a list of the Anglo-Saxon, Roman, Italic, and Old English Characters.

Saxon. Cap.	Saxon. Small.	Roman. Cap.	Roman. Small.	Italic. Cap.	Italic. Small.	Old English. Cap.	Old English. Small.	Name.
A	a	A	a	*A*	*a*	𝔄	𝔞	*ai.*
B	b	B	b	*B*	*b*	𝔅	𝔟	*bee.*
C	c	C	c	*C*	*c*	ℭ	𝔠	*see.*
D	ꝺ	D	d	*D*	*d*	𝔇	𝔡	*dee.*
E	e	E	e	*E*	*e*	𝔈	𝔢	*ee.*
F	ꝼ	F	f	*F*	*f*	𝔉	𝔣	*ef.*
Ᵹ	ᵹ	G	g	*G*	*g*	𝔊	𝔤	*jee.*
H	h	H	h	*H*	*h*	ℌ	𝔥	*aitch.*
I	i	I	i	*I*	*i*	ℑ	𝔦 𝔧	*i* or *eye.*
		J	j	*J*	*j*			*jay.*
K	k	K	k	*K*	*k*	𝔎	𝔨	*kay.*
L	l	L	l	*L*	*l*	𝔏	𝔩	*el.*
M	m	M	m	*M*	*m*	𝔐	𝔪	*em.*
N	n	N	n	*N*	*n*	𝔑	𝔫	*en.*
O	o	O	o	*O*	*o*	𝔒	𝔬	*o.*
P	p	P	p	*P*	*p*	𝔓	𝔭	*pee.*
		Q	q	*Q*	*q*	𝔔	𝔮	*cue.*
R	ꞃ	R	r	*R*	*r*	ℜ	𝔯 ꝛ	*ar.*
S	ꞅ	S	ſ s	*S*	*ſ s*	𝔖	ſ 𝔰	*ess.*
T	ꞇ	T	t	*T*	*t*	𝔗	𝔱	*tee.*
Ð	ð *th*							
U	u	U	u	*U*	*u*	𝔘	𝔲 𝔳	*u* or *you.*
V	v	V	v	*V*	*v*			*vee.*
Ƿ	ƿ	W	w	*W*	*w*	𝔚	𝔴	*double u.*
X	x	X	x	*X*	*x*	𝔛	𝔵	*eks.*
Y	ẏ	Y	y	*Y*	*y*	𝔜	𝔶	*wy.*
Z	z	Z	z	*Z*	*z*	ℨ	𝔷	*zed.*

A perfect alphabet of the English language, and, indeed, of every other language, would contain a number of letters, precisely equal to the number of simple articulate sounds belonging to the language. Every simple sound would have its distinct character; and that character be the representative of no other sound. But this is far from being the state of the English alphabet. It has more original sounds than distinct significant letters; and consequently, some of these letters are made to represent, not one sound alone, but several sounds. This will appear by reflecting, that the sounds signified by the united letters *th*, *sh*, *ng*, are elementary, and have no single appropriate characters, in our alphabet; and that the letters *a* and *u* represent the different sounds heard in *hat, hate, hall;* and in *but, bull, mule.*

To explain this subject more fully to the learners, we shall set down the characters made use of to represent all the elementary articulate sounds of our language, as nearly in the manner and order of the present English alphabet, as the design of the subject will admit; and shall annex to each character the syllable or word, which contains its proper and distinct sound. And here it will be proper to begin with the vowels.

Letters denoting the simple sounds.			Words containing the simple sounds.
a long	*as heard*	*in*	ale, pale.
a short	*as*	*in*	at, bat.
a middle	*as*	*in*	arm, farm.
a broad	*as*	*in*	all, call.
e long	*as*	*in*	me, bee.
e short	*as*	*in*	met, net.
i long	*as*	*in*	pine, pile.
i short	*as*	*in*	pin, tin.
o long	*as*	*in*	no, so.
o short	*as*	*in*	not, lot.
o middle	*as*	*in*	move, prove.
u long	*as*	*in*	muse, use.
u short	*as*	*in*	but, nut.
u middle	*as*	*in*	bull, full.

By the preceding list it appears, that there are in the English language fourteen simple vowel sounds: but as *i* and *u*, when pronounced long, may be considered as diphthongs, or diphthongal vowels, our language, strictly speaking, contains but twelve simple vowel sounds; to represent which, we have only five distinct characters or letters. If *a* in *arm*, is the same specific sound as *a* in *at*; and *u* in *bull*, the same as *o* in *move*, which is the opinion of some grammarians; then there are but ten original vowel sounds in the English language.

The following list denotes the sounds of the consonants, being in number twenty-two.

Letters denoting the simple sounds.			Words containing the simple sounds.
b	*as heard*	*in*	bat, tub,
d	*as*	*in*	dog, sod.
f	*as*	*in*	for, off.
v	*as*	*in*	van, love.
g	*as*	*in*	go, egg.
h *	*as*	*in*	hop, ho.
k	*as*	*in*	kill, oak.
l	*as*	*in*	lop, loll.
m	*as*	*in*	my, mum.
n	*as*	*in*	nod, nun.
p	*as*	*in*	pin, pup.
r	*as*	*in*	rap, tar.
s	*as*	*in*	so, lass.
z	*as*	*in*	zed, buzz.
t	*as*	*in*	top, mat.
w	*as*	*in*	wo, will.
y	*as*	*in*	ye, yes.
ng	*as*	*in*	king, sing.
sh	*as*	*in*	shy, ash.
th	*as*	*in*	thin, thick.
th	*as*	*in*	then, them.
zh	*as*	*in*	pleasure.

* Some grammarians suppose *h* to mark only an aspiration, or breathing: but it appears to be a distinct sound, and formed in a particular manner, by the organs of speech. *Encyclopædia Britannica.*

Several letters marked in the English alphabet, as consonants, are either superfluous, or represent, not simple, but complex sounds. *C*, for instance, is superfluous in both its sounds; the one being expressed by *k*, and the other by *s*. *G*, in the soft pronunciation, is not a simple, but a complex sound; as *age* is pronounced *aidge*. *J* is unnecessary, because its sound, and that of the soft *g*, are in our language the same. *Q*, with its attendant *u*, is either complex, and resolvable into *kw*, as in *quality;* or unnecessary, because its sound is the same with *k*, as in *opaque*. *X* is compounded of *gs*, as in *example;* or of *ks*, as in *expect*.

From the preceding representation, it appears to be a point of considerable importance, that every learner of the English language should be taught to pronounce perfectly, and with facility, every original simple sound that belongs to it. By a timely and judicious care in this respect, the voice will be prepared to utter, with ease and accuracy, every combination of sounds; and taught to avoid that confused and imperfect manner of pronouncing words, which accompanies, through life, many persons, who have not, in this respect, been properly instructed at an early period.

Letters are divided into Vowels and Consonants.

A Vowel is an articulate sound, that can be perfectly uttered by itself: as, *a, e, o;* which are formed without the help of any other sound.

A consonant is an articulate sound, which cannot be perfectly uttered without the help of a vowel: as, *b, d, f, l;* which require vowels to express them fully.

The vowels are, *a, e, i, o, u*, and sometimes *w* and *y*.

W and *y* are consonants when they begin a word or syllable; but in every other situation they are vowels.

It is generally aknowledged by the best grammarians, that *w* and *y* are consonants when they begin a syllable or word, and vowels when they end one. That they are consonants, when used as initials, seems to be evident from their not admitting the article *an* before them; as it would be improper to say, an walnut, an yard, &c. and from their following a vowel without any hiatus or difficulty of utterance: as, frosty winter, rosy youth. That they are vowels in other situations, appears from their regularly taking the sound of other vowels: as, *w* has the exact sound of *u* in saw, few, now, &c.; and *y* that of *i*, in hymn, fly, crystal, &c. See the letters W and Y, pages 42 and 43*.

We present the following as more exact and philosophical definitions of a vowel and consonant.

A vowel is a simple, articulate sound, perfect in itself, and formed by a continued effusion of the breath, and a certain conformation of the mouth, without any alteration in the position, or any motion of the organs of speech, from the moment the vocal sound commences, till it ends.

A consonant is a simple, articulate sound, imperfect by itself, but which, joined with a vowel, forms a complete sound, by a particular motion or contact of the organs of speech.

Some grammarians subdivide vowels into the *simple* and the *compound*. But there does not appear to be any foundation for the distinction. Simplicity is essential to

---

* The letters *w* and *y* are of an ambiguous nature; being consonants at the beginning of words, and vowels at the end. *Encyclopædia Britannica.*

WALKER's Critical Pronouncing Dictionary, page 24, *third edition.*

PERRY's English Dictionary, Preface, page 7.

the nature of a vowel, which excludes every degree of mixed or compound sounds. It requires, according to the definition, but one conformation of the organs of speech, to form it, and no motion in the organs, whilst it is forming.

Consonants are divided into mutes and semi-vowels.

The mutes cannot be sounded *at all*, without the aid of a vowel. They are *b*, *p*, *t*, *d*, *k*, and *c* and *g* hard.

The semi-vowels have an imperfect sound of themselves. They are *f*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *v*, *s*, *z*, *x*, and *c* and *g* soft.

Four of the semi-vowels, namely, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, are also distinguished by the name of *liquids*, from their readily uniting with other consonants, and flowing as it were into their sounds.

We have shown above, that it is essential to the nature of a consonant, that it cannot be fully uttered without the aid of a vowel. We may further observe, that even the *names* of the consonants, as they are pronounced in reciting the alphabet, require the help of vowels to express them. In pronouncing the names of the mutes, the assistant vowels *follow* the consonants: as, *be*, *pe*, *te*, *de*, *ka*. In pronouncing the names of the semi-vowels, the vowels generally *precede* the consonants: as, *ef*, *el*, *em*, *en*, *ar*, *es*, *ex*. The exceptions are, *ce*, *ge*, *ve*, *zed*.

This distinction between the *nature* and the *name* of a consonant, is of great importance, and should be well explained to the pupil. They are frequently confounded by writers on grammar. Observations and reasonings on the name, are often applied to explain the nature, of a consonant: and, by this means, the student is led into

error and perplexity, respecting these elements of language. It should be impressed on his mind, that the name of every consonant, is a *complex* sound; but that the consonant itself, is always a *simple* sound.

Some writers have described the mutes and semi-vowels, with their subdivisions, nearly in the following manner.

The *mutes* are those consonants, whose sounds cannot be protracted. The *semi-vowels*, such whose sounds can be continued at pleasure, partaking of the nature of vowels, from which they derive their name.

The mutes may be subdivided into *pure* and *impure*.

The pure are those whose sounds cannot be at all prolonged: they are *k*, *p*, *t*. The impure, are those whose sounds may be continued, though for a very short space: they are *b*, *d*, *g*.

The semi-vowels may be subdivided into *vocal* and *aspirated*. The vocal are those which are formed by the voice; the aspirated, those formed by the breath. There are eleven vocal, and five aspirated. The vocal are *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *v*, *w*, *y*, *z*, *th* flat, *zh*, *ng*: the aspirated, *f*, *h*, *s*, *th* sharp, *sh*.

The vocal semi-vowels may be subdivided into *pure* and *impure*. The pure are those which are formed entirely by the voice: the impure, such as have a mixture of breath with the voice. There are seven pure—*l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *w*, *y*, *ng*: four impure—*v*, *z*, *th* flat, *zh*.

A diphthong is the union of two vowels, pronounced by a single impulse of the voice: as, *ea* in beat, *ou* in sound.

A triphthong is the union of three vowels, pronounced in like manner: as, *eau* in beau, *iew* in view.

A proper diphthong is that in which both the vowels are sounded: as, *oi* in voice, *ou* in ounce.

An improper diphthong has but one of the vowels sounded: as, *ea* in eagle, *oa* in boat.

EACH of the diphthongal letters, was, doubtless, originally heard in pronouncing the words which contain them. Though this is not the case at present, with respect to many of them, these combinations still retain the name of diphthongs; but, to distinguish them, they are marked by the term *improper*. As the diphthong derives its name and nature from its sound, and not from its letters, and properly denotes a double vowel sound, no union of two vowels, where one is silent, can, in strictness, be entitled to that appellation; and the single letters *i* and *u*, when pronounced long, must, in this view, be considered as diphthongs. The triphthongs, having at most but two sounds, are merely ocular, and are, therefore, by some grammarians, classed with the diphthongs.

SECTION 2.

General observations on the sounds of the letters.

A

A has four sounds; the long or slender, the broad, the short or open, and the middle.

The long; as in name, basin, creation.

The broad; as in call, wall, all.

The short; as in barrel, fancy, glass.

The middle; as in far, farm, father.

The diphthong *aa* generally sounds like *a* short in proper names; as in Balaam, Canaan, Isaac; but not in Baal, Gaal.

Ae has the sound of long *e*. It is sometimes found in Latin words. Some authors retain this form: as, ænigma, æquator, &c.; but others have laid it aside, and write enigma, Cesar, Eneas, &c.

The diphthong *ai* has exactly the long slender sound of *a;* as in pail, tail, &c.; pronounced pale, tale, &c.: except plaid, again, raillery, fountain, Britain, and a few others.

Au is generally sounded like the broad *a;* as in taught, caught, &c. Sometimes like the short or open *a;* as in aunt, flaunt, gauntlet, &c. It has the sound of long *o* in hautboy; and that of *o* short in laurel, laudanum, &c.

Aw has always the sound of broad *a:* as in bawl, scrawl, crawl.

Ay, like its near relation *ai*, is pronounced like the long slender sound of *a;* as in pay, day, delay.

B

B keeps one unvaried sound, at the beginning, middle, and end of words; as in baker, number, rhubarb, &c.

In some words it is silent; as in thumb, debtor, subtle, &c. In others, besides being silent, it lengthens the syllable; as in climb, comb, tomb.

C

C has two different sounds.

A hard sound like *k*, before *a*, *o*, *u*, *r*, *l*, *t;* as, in cart, cottage, curious, craft, tract, cloth, &c.; and when it ends a syllable; as, in victim, flaccid.

A soft sound like *s* before *e*, *i*, and *y*, generally: as in centre, face, civil, cymbal, mercy, &c. It has sometimes the sound of *sh;* as in ocean, social.

C is mute in czar, czarina, victuals, &c.

C, says Dr. Johnson, according to English orthography, never ends a word; and therefore we find in our best dictionaries, stick, block, publick, politick, &c. But many writers of later years omit the *k* in words of two or more syllables; and this practice is gaining ground, though it is productive of irregularities; such as writing mimic and mimickry; traffic and trafficking.

Ch, is commonly sounded like *tch;* as in church, chin, chaff, charter: but in words derived from the Greek, has the sound of *k;* as in chymist, scheme, chorus, chyle, distich; and in foreign names: as, Achish, Baruch, Enoch, &c.

Ch, in some words derived from the French, takes the sound of *sh;* as in chaise, chagrin, chevalier, machine.

Ch in arch, before a vowel, sounds like *k;* as in archangel, archives, Archipelago; except in arched, archery, archer, and arch-enemy: but before a consonant it always sounds like *tch;* as in archbishop, archduke, archpresbyter, &c. *Ch* is silent in schedule, schism, and yacht.

D

D keeps one uniform sound, at the beginning, middle, and end of words; as in death, bandage, kindred; unless it may be said to take the sound of *t*, in stuffed, tripped, &c. stuft, tript, &c.

E

E has three different sounds.

A long sound; as in scheme, glebe, severe, pulley, turkey, behave, prejudge. See PROSODY. Chapter 1. Section 2. On "Quantity."

A short sound; as in men, bed, clemency.

An obscure and scarcely perceptible sound: as, open, lucre, participle.

It has sometimes the sound of middle *a;* as in clerk, serjeant; and sometimes that of short *i;* as in England, yes, pretty.

E is always mute at the end of a word, except in monosyllables that have no other vowel: as, me, he, she: or in substantives derived from the Greek: as, catastrophe, epitome, Penelope. It is used to soften and modify the foregoing consonants: as, force, rage, since, oblige:

or to lengthen the preceding vowel: as, can, cane; pin, pine; rob, robe.

The diphthong *ea* is generally sounded like *e* long; as in appear, beaver, creature, &c. It has also the sound of short *e;* as in breath, meadow, treasure. And it is sometimes pronounced like the long and slender *a;* as in bear, break, great.

Eau has the sound of long *o;* as in beau, flambeau, portmanteau. In beauty and its compounds, it has the sound of long *u.*

Ei, in general, sounds the same as long and slender *a;* as in deign, vein, neighbour, &c. It has the sound of long *e* in seize, deceit, receive, either, neither, &c. It is sometimes pronounced like short *i;* as in foreign, forfeit, sovereign, &c.

Eo is pronounced like *e* long; as in people; and sometimes like *e* short; as in leopard, jeopardy. It has also the sound of short *u;* as in dungeon, sturgeon, puncheon, &c.

Eu is always sounded like long *u* or *ew;* as in feud, deuce.

Ew is almost always pronounced like long *u;* as in few, new, dew.

Ey, when the accent is on it, is always pronounced like *a* long; as in bey, grey, convey; except in key, ley, where it is sounded like long *e.*

When this diphthong is unaccented, it takes the sound of *e* long: as, alley, valley, barley. See PROSODY. Chapter 1. Section 2. On "Quantity."

F

F keeps one pure unvaried sound at the beginning, middle, and end of words: as, fancy, muffin, mischief, &c.; except in *of,* in which it has the flat sound of *ov;* but not in composition: as, whereof, thereof, &c. We should not pronounce, a wive's jointure, a calve's head; but a wife's jointure, a calf's head.

G

G has two sounds: one hard; as in gay, go, gun: the other soft; as in gem, giant.

At the end of a word it is always hard; as in bag, snug, frog. It is hard before *a*, *o*, *u*, *l*, and *r*: as, game, gone, gull, glory, grandeur.

G before *e*, *i*, and *y*, is soft; as in genius, gesture, ginger, Egypt; except in get, gewgaw, finger, craggy, and some others.

G is mute before *n*; as in gnash, sign, foreign, &c.

Gn, at the end of a word, or syllable accented, gives the preceding vowel a long sound; as in resign, impugn, oppugn, impregn, impugned; pronounced impune, imprene, &c.

Gh, at the beginning of a word, has the sound of the hard *g*: as, ghost, ghastly: in the middle, and sometimes at the end, it is quite silent; as in right, high, plough, mighty.

At the end it has often the sound of *f*; as in laugh, cough, tough. Sometimes only the *g* is sounded; as in burgh, burgher.

H

The sound signified by this letter, is, as before observed, an articulate sound, and not merely an aspiration. It is heard in the words, hat, horse, Hull. It is seldom mute at the beginning of a word. It is always silent after *r*: as, rhetoric, rheum, rhubarb.

H final, preceded by a vowel, is always silent: as, ah! hah! oh! foh! Sarah, Messiah.

From the faintness of the sound of this letter, in many words, and its total silence in others, added to the negligence of tutors, and the inattention of pupils, it has happened, that many persons have become almost incapable of acquiring its just and full pronunciation. It is, there-

fore, incumbent on teachers, to be particularly careful to inculcate a clear and distinct utterance of this sound.

I

I has a long sound; as in fine; and a short one; as in fin.

The long sound is always marked by the *e* final in monosyllables: as, thin, thine; except give, live. Before *r* it is often sounded like a short *u*: as, flirt, first. In some words it has the sound of *e* long; as in machine, bombazine, magazine.

The diphthong *ia* is frequently sounded like *ya;* as in christian, filial, poniard; pronounced christ-yan, &c. It has sometimes the sound of short *i;* as in carriage, marriage, parliament.

Ie sounds in general like *e* long; as in grief, thief, grenadier. It has also the sound of long *i;* as in die, pie, lie; and sometimes that of short *i;* as in sieve.

Ieu has the sound of long *u;* as in lieu, adieu, purlieu.

Io, when the accent is upon the first vowel, forms two distinct syllables: as, priory, violet, violent. The terminations *tion* and *sion*, are sounded exactly like the verb shun; except when the *t* is preceded by *s* or *x;* as in question, digestion, combustion, mixtion, &c.

The triphthong *iou* is sometimes pronounced distinctly in two syllables; as in bilious, various, abstemious. But these vowels often coalesce into one syllable; as in precious, factious, noxious.

J

J is pronounced exactly like soft *g;* except in hallelujah, where it is pronounced like *y*.

K

K has the sound of *c* hard, and is used before *e* and *i*, where, according to English analogy, *c* would be soft: as,

kept, king, skirts. It is not sounded before *n;* as in knife, knell, knocker. It is never doubled; except in Habakkuk; but *c* is used before it, to shorten the vowel by a double consonant: as, cockle, pickle, sucker.

L

L has always a soft liquid sound; as in love, billow, quarrel. It is sometimes mute; as in half, talk, psalm. The custom is to double the *l* at the end of monosyllables, as, mill, will, fall; except where a diphthong precedes it: as, hail, toil, soil.

Le, at the end of words, is pronounced like a weak *el;* in which the *e* is almost mute: as, table, shuttle.

M

M has always the same sound: as, murmur, monumental; except in comptroller, which is pronounced controller.

N

N has two sounds: the one pure; as in man, net, noble; the other a ringing sound like *ng;* as in thank, banquet, &c.

N is mute when it ends a syllable, and is preceded by *m;* as, hymn, solemn, autumn.

The participial *ing* must always have its ringing sound: as, writing, reading, speaking. Some writers have supposed that when *ing* is preceded by *ing*, it should be pronounced *in;* as, singing, bringing, should be sounded *singin, bringin:* but as it is a good rule, with respect to pronunciation, to adhere to the written words, unless custom has clearly decided otherwise, it does not seem proper to adopt this innovation.

O

O has a long sound; as in note, bone, obedient, over; and a short one; as in not, got, lot, trot.

It has sometimes the short sound of *u:* as, son, come, attorney. And in some words it is sounded like *oo;* as in prove, move; and often like *au;* as in nor, for, lord.

The diphthong *oa* is regularly pronounced as the long sound of *o;* as in boat, oat, coal; except in broad, abroad, groat, where it takes the sound of broad *a:* as, brawd, &c.

Oe has the sound of single *e.* It is sometimes long; as in fœtus, Antœci: and sometimes short; as in œconomics, œcumenical. In doe, foe, sloe, toe, throe, hoe, and bilboes, it is sounded exactly like long *o.*

Oi has almost universally the double sound of *a* broad and *e* long united, as in boy: as, boil, toil, spoil, joint, point, anoint: which should never be pronounced as if written bile, spile, tile, &c.

Oo almost always preserves its regular sound; as in moon, soon, food. It has a shorter sound in wool, good, foot, and a few others. In blood and flood it sounds like short *u.* Door and floor should always be pronounced as if written dore and flore.

The diphthong *ou* has six different sounds. The first and proper sound is equivalent to *ow* in down; as in bound, found, surround.

The second is that of short *u;* as in enough, trouble, journey.

The third is that of *oo;* as in soup, youth, tournament.

The fourth is that of long *o;* as in though, mourn, poultice.

The fifth is that of short *o;* as in cough, trough.

The sixth is that of *awe;* as in ought, brought, thought.

Ow is generally sounded like *ou* in thou; as in brown, dowry, shower. It has also the sound of long *o;* as in snow, grown, bestow.

The diphthong *oy* is but another form for *oi,* and is pronounced exactly like it.

P

P has always the same sound, except, perhaps, in cupboard, where it sounds like *b*. It is sometimes mute; as in psalm, psalter, Ptolemy: and between *m* and *t;* as in tempt, empty, presumptuous.

Ph is generally pronounced like *f;* as in philosophy, philanthropy, Philip.

In nephew and Stephen, it has the sound of *v*. In apophthegm, phthisis, phthisic, and phthisical, both letters are entirely dropped.

Q

Q is always followed by *u:* as, quadrant, queen, quire.

Qu is sometimes sounded like *k:* as, conquer, liquor, risque.

R

R has a rough sound; as in Rome, river, rage: and a smooth one; as in bard, card, regard.

Re at the end of many words, is pronounced like a weak *er;* as in theatre, sepulchre, massacre.

S

S has two different sounds.

A soft and flat sound like *z:* as, besom, nasal, dismal.

A sharp hissing sound: as, saint, sister, cyprus.

It is always sharp at the beginning of words.

This letter has also the sound of *zh;* as in pleasure, measure, treasure, crosier.

At the end of words it takes the soft sound: as, his, was, trees, eyes; except in the words this, thus, us, yes, rebus, surplus, &c.; and in words terminating with *ous*.

It sounds like *z* before *ion*, if a vowel goes before: as, intrusion; but like *s* sharp, if it follows a consonant: as, conversion. It also sounds like *z* before *e* mute: as, amuse; and before *y* final: as, rosy; and in the words bosom, desire, wisdom, &c.

S is mute in isle, island, demesne, viscount.

T

T generally sounds, as in take, temper. *T* before *u*, when the accent *precedes*, sounds like *tch:* as, nature, virtue, are pronounced, natchure, virtchue. *Ti* before a vowel has the sound of *sh;* as in salvation: except in such words as tierce, tiara, &c. and unless an *s* goes before: as, question; and excepting also derivatives from words ending in *ty:* as, mighty, mightier.

Th has two sounds: the one soft and flat: as, thus, whether, heathen: the other hard and sharp: as, thing, think, breath.

Th, at the beginning of words, is sharp; as in thank, thick, thunder: except in that, then, thus, thither, and some others. *Th*, at the end of words, is also sharp: as, death, breath, mouth: except in with, booth, beneath, &c.

Th, in the middle of words, is sharp: as, panther, orthodox, misanthrope: except worthy, farthing, brethren, and a few others.

Th, between two vowels, is generally flat in words purely English: as, father, heathen, together, neither, mother.

Th, between two vowels, in words from the learned languages, is generally sharp: as, apathy, sympathy, Athens, theatre, apothecary.

Th is sometimes pronounced like simple *t:* as, Thomas, thyme, Thames, asthma.

U

U has three sounds, viz.

A long sound; as in mule, tube, cubic.

A short sound; as in dull, gull, custard.

An obtuse sound, like *oo;* as in bull, full, bushel.

The strangest deviation of this letter from its natural sound, is in the words busy, business, bury, and burial; which are pronounced bizzy, bizness, berry, and berrial.

A is now often used before words beginning with *u* long,

and *an* always before those that begin with *u* short: as, a union, a university, a useful book; an uproar, an usher, an umbrella.

The diphthong *ua*, has sometimes the sound of *wa;* as in assuage, persuade, antiquary. It has also the sound of middle *a;* as in guard, guardian, guarantee.

Ue is often sounded like *we;* as in quench, querist, conquest. It has also the sound of long *u;* as in cue, hue, ague. In a few words, it is pronounced like *e* short; as in guest, guess. In some words it is entirely sunk; as in antique, oblique, prorogue, catalogue, dialogue, &c.

Ui is frequently pronounced *wi;* as in languid, anguish, extinguish. It has sometimes the sound of *i* long; as in guide, guile, disguise: and sometimes that of *i* short; as in guilt, guinea, guildhall. In some words it is sounded like long *u;* as in juice, suit, pursuit: and after *r*, like *oo;* as in bruise, fruit, recruit.

Uo is pronounced like *wo;* as in quote, quorum, quondam.

Uy has the sound of long *e;* as in obloquy, soliloquy; pronounced obloquee, &c. except buy, and its derivatives.

V

V has the sound of flat *f*, and bears the same relation to it, as *b* does to *p*, *d* to *t*, hard *g* to *k*, and *z* to *s*. It has also one uniform sound: as, vain, vanity, love.

W

W, when a consonant, has nearly the sound of *oo;* as water resembles the sound of *ooater:* but that it has a stronger and quicker sound than *oo*, and has a formation essentially different, will appear to any person who pronounces, with attention, the words *wo*, *woo*, *beware;* and who reflects that it will not admit the article *an* before it; which *oo* would admit. In some words it is not sounded;

as in answer, sword, wholesome: it is always silent before *r;* as in wrap, wreck, wrinkle, wrist, wrong, wry, bewray, &c.

W before *h* is pronounced as if it were after the *h:* as, why, hwy; when, hwen; what, hwat.

W is often joined to *o* at the end of a syllable, without affecting the sound of that vowel; as in crow, blow, grow, know, row, flow, &c.

When *w* is a vowel, and is distinguished in the pronunciation, it has exactly the same sound as *u* would have in the same situation: as, draw, crew, view, now, sawyer, vowel, outlaw.

X

X has three sounds, viz.

It is sounded like *z* at the beginning of proper names of Greek original; as in Xanthus, Xenophon, Xerxes.

It has a sharp sound like *ks*, when it ends a syllable with the accent upon it: as, exit, exercise, excellence; or when the accent is on the next syllable, if it begins with a consonant: as, excuse, extent, expense.

It has, generally, a flat sound like *gz*, when the accent is not on it, and the following syllable begins with a vowel: as, exert, exist, example; pronounced, egzert, egzist, egzample.

Y

Y, when a consonant, has nearly the sound of *ee;* as, youth, York, resemble the sound of eeouth, eeork: but that this is not its exact sound, will be clearly perceived by pronouncing the words *ye*, *yes*, *new-year*, in which its just and proper sound is ascertained. It not only requires a stronger exertion of the organs of speech to pronounce it, than is required to pronounce *ee;* but its formation is essentially different. It will not admit of *an* before it, as *ee* will in the following example; an *eel*. The

opinion that *y* and *w*, when they begin a word or syllable, take exactly the sound of *ee* and *oo*, has induced some grammarians to assert, that these letters are always vowels or diphthongs.

When *y* is a vowel, it has exactly the same sound as *i* would have in the same situation: as, rhyme, system, justify, pyramid, party, fancy, hungry. See PROSODY. Chapter 1. Section 2. On "Quantity."

Z

Z has the sound of an *s* uttered with a closer compression of the palate by the tongue: it is the flat *s:* as, freeze, frozen, brazen.

It may be proper to remark, that the sounds of the letters vary, as they are differently associated, and that the pronunciation of these associations depends upon the position of the accent. It may also be observed, that, in order to pronounce accurately, great attention must be paid to the vowels which are not accented. There is scarcely any thing which more distinguishes a person of a poor education, from a person of a good one, than the pronunciation of the *unaccented* vowels. When vowels are *under the accent*, the best speakers and the lowest of the people, with very few exceptions, pronounce them in the same manner; but the unaccented vowels in the mouths of the former, have a distinct, open, and specific sound, while the latter often totally sink them, or change them into some other sound.

Section 3.

Of the organs of articulation.

A concise account of the origin and formation of the sounds emitted by the human voice, may, perhaps, not improperly, be here introduced. It may gratify the ingenious student, and serve to explain more fully the nature of articulation, and the radical distinction between vowels and consonants.

" Human voice is air sent out from the lungs, and so agitated or modified in its passage through the windpipe and larynx, as to become distinctly audible. The windpipe is that tube, which on touching the forepart of our throat externally, we feel hard and uneven. It conveys air into the lungs for the purpose of breathing and speech. The top or upper part of the windpipe is called the *larynx*, consisting of four or five cartilages, that may be expanded or brought together, by the action of certain muscles which operate all at the same time. In the middle of the larynx there is a small opening, called the *glottis*, through which the breath and voice are conveyed. This opening is not wider than one tenth of an inch; and, therefore, the breath transmitted through it from the lungs, must pass with considerable velocity. The voice thus formed, is strengthened and softened, by a reverberation from the palate and other hollow places in the inside of the mouth and nostrils; and as these are better or worse shaped for this reverberation, the voice is said to be more or less agreeable.

If we consider the many varieties of sound, which one and the same human voice is capable of uttering, together with the smallness of the diameter of the glottis; and reflect, that the same diameter must always produce the same tone, and, consequently, that to every change of tone a

correspondent change of diameter is necessary; we must be filled with admiration at the mechanism of these parts, and the fineness of the fibres that operate in producing effects so minute, so various, and in their proportions so exactly uniform. For it admits of proof, that the diameter of the human glottis, is capable of more than sixty distinct degrees of contraction or enlargement, by each of which a different note is produced; and yet the greatest diameter of that aperture, as before observed, does not exceed one tenth of an inch.

Speech is made up of *articulate* voices; and what we call *articulation*, is performed, not by the lungs, windpipe, or larynx, but by the action of the throat, palate, teeth, tongue, lips, and nostrils. Articulation begins not, till the breath, or voice, has passed through the larynx.

The simplest articulate voices are those which proceed from an open mouth, and are by grammarians called *vowel* sounds. In transmitting these, the aperture of the mouth may be pretty large, or somewhat smaller, or very small; which is one cause of the variety of vowels; a particular sound being produced by each particular aperture. Moreover, in passing through an open mouth, the voice may be *gently acted upon*, by the lips, or by the tongue and palate, or by the tongue and throat; whence another source of variety in vowel sounds.

Thus ten or twelve simple vowel sounds may be formed, agreeably to the plan in page 26; and the learners, by observing the position of their mouth, lips, tongue, &c. when they are uttering the sounds, will perceive that various operations of these organs of speech, are necessary to the production of the different vowel sounds; and that by minute variations they may all be distinctly pronounced.

When the voice, in its passage through the mouth, is *totally intercepted*, or *strongly compressed*, there is formed a certain modification of articulate sound, which, as expressed by a character in writing, is called a *consonant*. Silence is

the effect of a total interception; and indistinct sound, of a strong compression: and therefore a consonant is not of itself a distinct articulate voice; and its influence in varying the tones of language is not clearly perceived, unless it be accompanied by an opening of the mouth, that is, by a vowel.

By making the experiment with attention, the student will perceive that each of the *mutes* is formed by the voice being *intercepted*, by the lips, by the tongue and palate, or by the tongue and throat; and that the *semi-vowels* are formed by the same organs *strongly compressing* the voice in its passage, but not totally intercepting it.

The elements of language, according to the different seats where they are formed, or the several organs of speech chiefly concerned in their pronunciation, are divided into several classes, and denominated as follows: those are called *labials*, which are formed by the lips; those *dentals*, that are formed with the teeth; *palatals*, that are formed with the palate; and *nasals*, that are formed by the nose."

The importance of obtaining, in early life, a clear, distinct, and accurate knowledge of the sounds of the first principles of language, and a wish to lead young minds to a further consideration of a subject so curious and useful, have induced the compiler to bestow particular attention on the preceding part of his work. Some writers think that these subjects do not properly constitute any part of grammar; and consider them as the exclusive province of the spelling-book: but if we reflect, that letters and their sounds are the constituent principles of that art, which teaches us to speak and write with propriety, and that, in general, very little knowledge of their nature is acquired by the spelling-book, we must admit, that they properly belong to grammar; and that a rational consideration of these elementary principles of language, is an object that

demands the attention of the young grammarian. The sentiments of a very judicious and eminent writer, (Quinctilian,) respecting this part of grammar, may, perhaps, be properly introduced on the present occasion.

"Let no persons despise, as inconsiderable, the elements of grammar, because it may seem to them a matter of small consequence, to show the distinction between vowels and consonants, and to divide the latter into liquids and mutes. But they who penetrate into the innermost parts of this temple of science, will there discover such refinement and subtility of matter, as are not only proper to sharpen the understandings of young persons, but sufficient to give exercise for the most profound knowledge and erudition."

The elementary sounds, under their smallest combination, produce a *syllable;* syllables properly combined produce a *word;* words duly combined produce a *sentence;* and sentences properly combined produce an *oration* or *discourse*. Thus it is, says HARRIS, in his HERMES, that to principles apparently so trivial as a few plain elementary sounds, we owe that variety of articulate voices, which has been sufficient to explain the sentiments of so innumerable a multitude, as all the present and past generations of men.

TANJORE MAHARAJA SERFOJI'S SARASVATI MAHAL

CHAPTER II.

OF SYLLABLES, AND THE RULES FOR ARRANGING THEM.

A SYLLABLE is a sound, either simple or compounded, pronounced by a single impulse of the voice, and constituting a word, or part of a word: as, a, an, ant.

Spelling is the art of rightly dividing words into their syllables, or of expressing a word by its proper letters.

THE following are the general rules for the division of words into syllables.

1. A single consonant between two vowels, must be joined to the latter syllable: as, de-light, bri-dal, re-source; except the letter x: as, ex-ist, ex-amine; and except likewise words compounded: as, up-on, un-even, dis-ease.

2. Two consonants proper to begin a word, must not be separated: as, fa-ble, sti-fle. But when they come between two vowels, and are such as cannot begin a word, they must be divided: as, ut-most, un-der, in-sect, er-ror, cof-fin.

3. When three consonants meet in the middle of a word, if they can begin a word, and the preceding vowel is pronounced long, they are not to be separated: as, de-throne, de-stroy. But when the vowel of the preceding syllable is pronounced short, one of the consonants always belongs to that syllable: as, dis-tract, dis-prove, dis-train.

4. When three or four consonants, which are not proper to begin a syllable, meet between two vowels, such of them as can begin a syllable belong to the latter, the rest to the former syllable: as, ab-stain, com-plete, em-broil, trans-gress, dap-ple, con-strain, hand-some, parch-ment.

5. Two vowels, not being a diphthong, must be divided into separate syllables: as, cru-el, de-ni-al, so-ci-e-ty.

6. Compounded words must be traced into the simple words of which they are composed: as, ice-house, glow-worm, over-power, never-the-less.

7. Grammatical, and other particular terminations, are generally separated: as, teach-est, teach-eth, teach-ing, teach-er, contend-est, great-er, wretch-ed, good-ness, free-dom, false-hood.

The rules for dividing words into syllables, with the reasons in support of them, are expressed at large in the author's English Spelling-book, *Sixth*, or any subsequent edition, page 210—215.

CHAPTER III

OF WORDS IN GENERAL, AND THE RULES FOR SPELLING THEM.

See Volume II. Page 53.

WORDS are articulate sounds, used by common consent, as signs of our ideas.

A word of one syllable is termed a Monosyllable; a word of two syllables, a Dissyllable; a word of three syllables, a Trisyllable; and a word of four or more syllables, a Polysyllable.

All words are either primitive or derivative.

A primitive word is that which cannot be reduced to any simpler word in the language: as, man, good, content.

A derivative word is that which may be reduced to another word in English of greater simplicity: as, manful, goodness, contentment, Yorkshire*.

THERE are many English words which, though compounds in other languages, are to us primitives: thus circumspect, circumvent, circumstance, delude, concave, complicate, &c. primitive words in English, will be found derivatives, when traced in the Latin tongue.

The orthography of the English Language is attended with much uncertainty and perplexity. But a considerable part of this inconvenience may be remedied, by attending to the general laws of formation; and, for this end, the

---

* A compound word is included under the head of derivative words: as, penknife, teacup, looking-glass; may be reduced to other words of greater simplicity.

learner is presented with a view of such general maxims, in spelling primitive and derivative words, as have been almost universally received.

Rule 1.

Monosyllables ending with *f*, *l*, or *s*, preceded by a single vowel, double the final consonant: as, staff, mill, pass, &c. The only exceptions are, of, if, as, is, has, was, yes, his, this, us, and thus.

Rule 2.

Monosyllables ending with any consonant but *f*, *l*, or *s*, and preceded by a single vowel, never double the final consonant; excepting add, ebb, butt, egg, odd, err, inn, bunn, purr, and buzz.

Rule 3.

Words ending with *y*, preceded by a consonant, form the plurals of nouns, the persons of verbs, verbal nouns, past participles, comparatives, and superlatives, by changing *y* into *i*: as, spy, spies; I carry, thou carriest; he carrieth, or carries; carrier, carried; happy, happier, happiest.

The present participle in *ing*, retains the *y*, that *i* may not be doubled: as, carry, carrying; bury, burying, &c.

But *y*, preceded by a vowel, in such instances as the above, is not changed: as, boy, boys; I cloy, he cloys, cloyed, &c.; except in lay, pay, and say; from which are formed, laid, paid, and said; and their compounds, unlaid, unpaid, unsaid, &c.

Rule 4.

Words ending with *y*, preceded by a consonant, upon assuming an additional syllable beginning with a consonant, commonly change *y* into *i*: as, happy, happily, happiness. But when *y* is preceded by a vowel, it is very

rarely changed in the additional syllable: as, coy, coyly; boy, boyish, boyhood; annoy, annoyer, annoyance; joy, joyless, joyful.

Rule 5.

Monosyllables, and words accented on the last syllable, ending with a single consonant preceded by a single vowel, double that consonant, when they take another syllable beginning with a vowel: as, wit, witty; thin, thinnish; to abet, an abettor; to begin, a beginner.

But if a diphthong precedes, or the accent is on the preceding syllable, the consonant remains single: as, to toil, toiling; to offer, an offering; maid, maiden, &c.

Rule 6.

Words ending with any double letter but *l*, and taking *ness*, *less*, *ly*, or *ful*, after them, preserve the letter double: as, harmlessness, carelessness, carelessly, stiffly, successful, distressful, &c. But those words which end with double *l*, and take *ness*, *less*, *ly*, or *ful*, after them, generally omit one *l*: as, fulness, skilless, fully, skilful, &c.

Rule 7.

Ness, *less*, *ly*, and *ful*, added to words ending with silent *e*, do not cut it off: as, paleness, guileless, closely, peaceful; except in a few words: as, duly, truly, awful.

Rule 8.

Ment, added to words ending with silent *e*, generally preserves the *e* from elision: as, abatement, chastisement, incitement, &c. The words judgment, abridgment, acknowledgment, are deviations from the rule.

Like other terminations, *ment* changes *y* into *i*, when preceded by a consonant: as, accompany, accompaniment; merry, merriment.

RULE 9.

Able and *ible*, when incorporated into words ending with silent *e*, almost always cut it off: as, blame, blamable; cure, curable; sense, sensible, &c.: but if *c* or *g* soft comes before *e* in the original word, the *e* is then preserved in words compounded with *able:* as, change, changeable; peace, peaceable, &c.

RULE 10.

When *ing* or *ish* is added to words ending with silent *e*, the *e* is almost universally omitted: as, place, placing; lodge, lodging; slave, slavish; prude, prudish; blue, bluish; white, whitish.

RULE 11.

Compounded words are generally spelled in the same manner as the simple words of which they are formed: as, glasshouse, skylight, thereby, hereafter. Many words ending with double *l*, are exceptions to this rule: as, already, welfare, wilful, fulfil: and also the words wherever, christmas, lammas, &c.

The orthography of a great number of English words, is far from being uniform, even amongst writers of distinction. Thus, *honour* and *honor*, *inquire* and *enquire*, *negotiate* and *negociate*, *control* and *controul*, *expense* and *expence*, *allege* and *alledge*, *surprise* and *surprize*, *complete* and *compleat*, *connexion* and *connection*, *abridgment* and *abridgement*, and many other orthographical variations, are to be met with in the best modern publications. Some authority for deciding differences of this nature, appears to be necessary: and where can we find one of equal pretensions with Dr. Johnson's Dictionary? though a few of his decisions do not appear to be war-

ranted by the principles of etymology and analogy, the stable foundations of his improvements.—" As the weight of truth and reason (says Nares in his " Elements of Orthoepy") is irresistible, Dr. Johnson's Dictionary has nearly fixed the external form of our language. Indeed so convenient is it to have one acknowledged standard to recur to ; so much preferable, in matters of this nature, is a trifling degree of irregularity, to a continual change, and fruitless pursuit of unattainable perfection ; that it is earnestly to be hoped, that no author will henceforth, on light grounds, be tempted to innovate."

This Dictionary, however, contains some orthographical inconsistencies, which ought to be rectified: such as, *immovable moveable*, *chastely chastness*, *fertileness fertily*, *sliness slyly*, *fearlessly fearlesness*, *needlessness needlesly*. If these, and similar irregularities, were corrected by spelling the words analogically, according to the first word in each part of the series, and agreeably to the general rules of spelling, the Dictionary would doubtless, in these respects, be improved.

" Every thing deserves praise, which is done with a view to make language durable: for on the permanency of any tongue depends that of the literature conveyed in it. And if new words, new letters, or new modes of spelling, might be introduced at pleasure, language would soon be disfigured and altered; the old authors would ere long be laid aside as unintelligible, and the new would be consigned to oblivion before their time. Yet several attempts were made in the sixteenth century, to alter the spelling, and even the alphabet, of the English tongue. Sir Thomas Smith, Dr. Gill, and Charles Butler, thought it absurd to speak one way, and write another; and seem to have founded their respective plans of improvement upon this principle, that pronunciation ought to determine orthography: not considering that, as Dr.

Johnson well observes, "This is to measure by a shadow, and take that for a model or standard, which is changing while they apply it." For, according to this rule, pronunciation ought to be uniform throughout the kingdom; which, however desirable, and however easy it may have appeared to some projectors, is indeed scarcely practicable: and the alphabet, or the mode of spelling, must vary continually as the pronunciation varies; which would be a matter of such nicety, as no degree of human wisdom could regulate. Besides, reformations of this kind, supposed practicable, would obliterate etymology, and, with that, the remembrance of many old customs and sentiments; would take away from the significancy of many important words; and involve in confusion both our grammar and our policy."

PART II.

ETYMOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

A GENERAL VIEW OF THE PARTS OF SPEECH.

THE second part of grammar is ETYMOLOGY, which treats of the different sorts of words, their various modifications, and their derivation.

There are, in English, nine sorts of words, or, as they are commonly called, PARTS OF SPEECH; namely;

1. ARTICLE,
2. SUBSTANTIVE OR NOUN,
3. ADJECTIVE,
4. PRONOUN,
5. VERB,
6. ADVERB,
7. PREPOSITION,
8. CONJUNCTION,
AND
9. INTERJECTION.

1. An Article is a word prefixed to substantives, to point them out, and to show how far their signification extends: as, *a* garden, *an* eagle, *the* woman.

2. A Substantive or noun is the name of any thing that exists, or of which we have any notion: as, *London, man, virtue.*

A substantive may, in general, be distinguished by its taking an article before it, or by its making sense of itself: as, a *book*, the *sun*, an *apple; temperance, industry, chastity.*

3. An Adjective is a word added to a substantive, to express its quality: as, "An *industrious* man; a *virtuous* woman."

An Adjective may be known by its making sense with the addition of the word *thing*: as, a *good* thing; a *bad* thing: or of any particular substantive: as, a *sweet* apple, a *pleasant* prospect, a *lively* bcy.

4. A pronoun is a word used instead of a noun, to avoid the too frequent repetition of the same word: as, "The man is happy; *he* is benevolent; *he* is useful."

5. A verb is a word which signifies to BE, to DO, or to SUFFER: as, "I *am*; I *rule*; I *am ruled*."

A verb may generally be distinguished, by its making sense with any of the personal pronouns, or the word *to* before it: as, I *walk*, he *plays*, they *write*; or, to *walk*, to *play*, to *write*.

6. An Adverb is a part of speech joined to a verb, an adjective, and sometimes to another adverb, to express some quality or circumstance respecting it: as, "He reads *well*; a *truly* good man; he writes *very correctly*."

An Adverb may be generally known, by its answering to the question, How? how much? when? or where? as, in the phrase, "He reads *correctly*," the answer to the question, How does he read? is, *correctly*.

7. Prepositions serve to connect words with one another, and to show the relation between them: as, "He went *from* London *to* York;" "she is *above* disguise;" "they are supported *by* industry."

A Preposition may be known by its admitting after it a personal pronoun, in the objective case; as, *with*, *for*, *to*, &c. will allow the objective case after them; with *him*, for *her*, to *them*, &c.

8. A Conjunction is a part of speech that is chiefly used to connect sentences, so as, out of two or more sentences, to make but one: it sometimes connects only words: as, "Thou *and* he are happy, *because* you are good." "Two *and* three are five."

9. Interjections are words thrown in between the parts of a sentence, to express the passions or emotions of the speaker: as, "O virtue! how amiable thou art!"

THE observations which have been made, to aid learners in distinguishing the parts of speech from one another, may afford them some small assistance; but it will certainly be much more instructive, to distinguish them by the definitions, and an accurate knowledge of their nature.

In the following passage, all the parts of speech are exemplified:

The[1] power[2] of[7] speech[2] is[5] a[1] faculty[2] peculiar[3] to[7] man[2]; and[8] was[5] bestowed[5] on[7] him[4] by[7] his[4] beneficent[3] Creator[2], for[7] the[1] greatest[3] and[8] most[6] excellent[3] uses[2]; but[8] alas[9]! how[6] often[6] do[5] we[4] pervert[5] it[4] to[7] the[1] worst[3] of[7] purposes[2]!

In the foregoing sentence, the words *the*, *a*, are articles; *power*, *speech*, *faculty*, *man*, *Creator*, *uses*, *purposes*, are substantives; *peculiar*, *beneficent*, *greatest*, *excellent*, *worst*, are adjectives; *him*, *his*, *we*, *it*, are pronouns; *is*, *was*, *bestowed*, *do*, *pervert*, are verbs; *most*, *how*, *often*, are

E 4

adverbs; *of, to, on, by, for*, are prepositions; *and, but*, are conjunctions; and *alas* is an interjection.

The number of the different sorts of words, or of the parts of speech, has been variously reckoned by different grammarians. Some have enumerated ten, making the participle a distinct part; some eight, excluding the participle, and ranking the adjective under the noun; some four, and others only two, (the noun and the verb,) supposing the rest to be contained in the parts of their division. We have followed those authors, who appear to have given them the most natural and intelligible distribution. Some remarks on the division made by the learned Horne Tooke, are contained in the first section of the eleventh chapter of Etymology.

To assign names to objects of thought, and to express their properties and qualities, are the only indispensable requisites in language. If this be admitted, it follows, that the noun and the verb are the only parts of speech, which are essentially necessary; the former being the name of the thing of which we speak, and the latter expressing what we think of it. All other sorts of words must be regarded as subsidiaries, convenient indeed for the more easy communication of thought, but by no means indispensably requisite.

The interjection seems scarcely worthy of being considered as a part of artificial language or speech, being rather a branch of that natural language, which we possess in common with the brute creation, and by which we express the sudden emotions and passions that actuate our frame. But, as it is used in written as well as oral language, it may, in some measure, be deemed a part of speech. It is with us, a virtual sentence, in which the noun and verb are concealed under an imperfect or indigested word.

Whilst some grammarians have objected to the usual number and arrangement of the parts of speech, others have disapproved of the terms by which they have been designated. Instead of the generally received appellations of *nouns*, *pronouns*, *adjectives*, *adverbs*, and *conjunctions*, they have adopted those of *names*, *substitutes*, *attributes*, *modifiers*, and *connectives*. This spirit of innovation has extended itself to other parts of grammar, and especially to the names of the Tenses. Not satisfied with the ancient and approved terms, several writers on the subject, have introduced the following, as more accurate and expressive: *Present tense indefinite*, *Present tense emphatic*, *Present progressive or continued*; *Past tense continuately*, *Prior past tense indefinite*, *Preterite indefinite and emphatic*; *The foretelling future imperfect*, *Prior future indefinite*, *Future imperfect progressive*: and many others, corresponding with these, which it would be tedious to enumerate.

Of what use such deviations from the customary, established terms of our best grammarians, can be productive, we are unable to conceive. They certainly tend to perplex and confound the student, if their promoters advanced no farther: but when we reflect that the friends and projectors of such innovations, may be continually altering and extending our grammatical nomenclature; there appears to be additional reason for rejecting them, and adhering to long-established names. These are universally intelligible; and, if preserved, would produce a happy uniformity among all the teachers and learners of the language. They have likewise a great similarity to the terms used in teaching other languages; and, on this ground also, it is highly proper to retain them.

If any of the old terms should appear to be, in some respects, too comprehensive; and, in others, too limited; it would be much more eligible, to contract or enlarge their extent, by explanatory notes and observations, than

by sweeping away our ancient landmarks, and setting up others; which, after all, are without authority, and may themselves, when critically examined, be found inconvenient and exceptionable.

We shall close our remarks on this subject, by introducing the sentiments of Dr. Johnson respecting it: they are extracted from his "Grammar of the English Tongue."—"In this division and order of the parts of grammar, I follow (says he) the common grammarians, without inquiring whether a fitter distribution might not be found. Experience has long shown this method to be so distinct as to obviate confusion, and so comprehensive as to prevent any inconvenient omissions. I likewise use the terms already received, and already understood, though perhaps others more proper might sometimes be invented. Sylburgius, and other innovators, whose new terms have sunk their learning into neglect, have left sufficient warning against the trifling ambition of teaching arts in a new language."

CHAPTER II.

OF THE ARTICLES.

An Article is a word prefixed to substantives, to point them out, and to show how far their signification extends: as, *a* garden, *an* eagle, *the* woman.

In English, there are but two articles, *a* and *the*: *a* becomes *an* before a vowel*, and before a silent *h*: as, *an* acorn, *an* hour. But if the *h* be sounded, the *a* only is to be used: as, *a* hand, *a* heart, *a* highway.

The inattention of writers and printers to this necessary distinction, has occasioned the frequent use of *an* before *h*, when it is to be pronounced; and this circumstance, more than any other, has probably contributed to that indistinct utterance, or total omission, of the sound signified by this letter, which very often occurs amongst readers and speakers. *An* horse, *an* husband, *an* herald, *an* heathen, and many similar associations, are frequently to be found in works of taste and merit. To remedy this evil, readers should be taught to omit, in all similar cases, the sound of the *n*, and to give the *h* its full pronunciation.

A or *an* is styled the indefinite article: it is used in a vague sense to point out one single thing of

---

* *A* instead of *an* is now used before words beginning with *u* long. See page 45, letter *U*. It is used before *one*: as, many a one.—*An* must be used before words where the *h* is not silent, if the accent is on the second syllable: as, *an heroic action*, *an historical account*, *&c.*

the kind, in other respects indeterminate: as, "Give me *a* book;" "Bring me *an* apple."

The is called the definite article; because it ascertains what particular thing or things are meant: as, "Give me *the* book;" "Bring me *the* apples;" meaning some book, or apples, referred to.

A substantive without any article to limit it, is generally taken in its widest sense: as, "A candid temper is proper for man;" that is, for all mankind.

The peculiar use and importance of the articles will be seen in the following examples: "The son of a king—the son of the king—a son of the king." Each of these three phrases has an entirely different meaning, through the different application of the articles *a* and *the*.

"Thou art *a* man;" is a very general and harmless position; but, "Thou art *the* man," (as Nathan said to David,) is an assertion capable of striking terror and remorse into the heart.

The article is omitted before nouns that imply the different virtues, vices, passions, qualities, sciences, arts, metals, herbs, &c.: as, prudence is commendable; falsehood is odious; anger ought to be avoided;" &c. It is not prefixed to a proper name: as, "Alexander," (because that of itself denotes a determinate individual or particular thing,) except for the sake of distinguishing a particular family: as, "He is *a* Howard, or of the family of the Howards;" or by way of eminence: as, Every man is not *a* Newton;" "He has the courage of *an* Achilles:" or when some noun is understood: "He sailed down *the* (river) Thames, in *the* (ship) Britannia."

When an adjective is used with the noun to which the article relates, it is placed between the article and the noun: as, "a *good* man," "an *agreeable* woman," "the *best* friend." On some occasions, however, the adjective

precedes *a* or *an:* as, "*such* a shame," "as *great* a man as Alexander," "too *careless* an author."

The indefinite article can be joined to substantives in the singular number only; the definite article may be joined also to plurals.

But there appears to be a remarkable exception to this rule, in the use of the adjectives *few* and *many*, (the latter chiefly with the word *great* before it,) which, though joined with plural substantives, yet admit of the singular article *a:* as, *a few* men; *a great many* men.

The reason of it is manifest, from the effect which the article has in these phrases: it means a small or great number collectively taken; and therefore gives the idea of a whole, that is, of unity. Thus likewise, a dozen, a score, a hundred, or a thousand, is one whole number, an aggregate of many collectively taken; and therefore still retains the article *a*, though joined as an adjective to a plural substantive: as, a hundred years, &c.

The indefinite article is sometimes placed between the adjective *many*, and a singular noun: as,

"Full *many a gem* of purest ray serene,
"The dark unfathom'd caves of ocean bear:
"Full *many a flow'r* is born to blush unseen,
"And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

In these lines, the phrases, *many a gem*, and *many a flow'r*, refer to *many gems*, and *many flowers*, separately, not collectively considered.

The definite article *the* is frequently applied to adverbs in the comparative and superlative degree; and its effect is, to mark the degree the more strongly, and to define it the more precisely: as, "*The* more I examine it, *the* better I like *it*. I like this *the* least of any."

"That which is nearly connected with us, or with which, from its vicinity, we have been long acquainted, becomes eminent or distinguishable in our eyes, even though, in itself, and compared with other things of the same kind, it is of no particular importance. A person who resides near a very little town, speaks of it by the name of *the town.* Every clergyman within his own parish, is called *the minister*, or *the parson;* and if, in a village, there be but one barber or one smith, his neighbours think they distinguish him sufficiently, by calling him *the smith* or *the barber.* A tree, a rock, a hill, a river, a meadow, may be spoken of in the same manner, with the same emphasis. He is not returned from *the hill:* he is bathing in *the river:* I saw him on the top of *the rock:* shall we walk in *the meadow?* A branch is blown down from *the tree.* In these examples, the definite article is used; because the thing spoken of, being in the neighbourhood, is well known, and a matter of some consequence to the people who are acquainted with it.

That we may perceive, still more clearly, the nature and significancy of the articles, let us put the one for the other, and mark the effect. When it is said, that "the ancestors of the present royal family were kings in England three hundred years before *the* Conqueror," the sense is clear; as every body knows, that the person here spoken of, by the name of *the conqueror*, is William duke of Normandy, who subdued England about seven hundred and fifty years ago. But if we say, that "the ancestors of the present Royal Family were kings in England three hundred years before *a* conqueror," we speak nonsense.—Again, when it is said, that "health is *a* most desirable thing," there is no man who will not acquiesce in the position; which only means, that health is *one* of those things that are to be very much desired. But if we take the other article, and say, "Health is

the most desirable thing," we change the position from truth to falsehood: for this would imply, that nothing is so desirable as health; which is very wide of the truth; virtue, and a good conscience, being of infinitely greater value.—Moreover, if, instead of, "Man is born to trouble," we say, "*A* man is born to trouble," there is no material change in the sense; only the former is more solemn, perhaps because it is more concise: and here we may perceive, that the indefinite article is sometimes of no great use. But if we say, "*The* man is born to trouble," the maxim is no longer general; some one particular man is intimated; and they to whom we speak, may naturally ask, What man?—Sometimes our two articles do not differ widely in signification. Thus, we may say, "It is true, as *the* proverb declares," or "It is true as *a* proverb, or as *a certain* proverb declares, that" &c: and the change of the article does not make any material change in the sense.

On the whole, as articles are by their nature definitives, it follows of course, that they cannot be united with such words as are, in their own nature, *as definite as they may be;* (the personal pronouns for instance;) nor with such words as, *being undefinable, cannot properly be made otherwise;* (as the interrogative pronouns;) but only with those words, which, *though indefinite, are yet capable, by means of the article, of becoming definite.*"

Though the definitions and uses of the articles, as we have explained them, are conformable to those exhibited by Harris, Lowth, Johnson, Beattie, Priestley, Blair, Coote, Crombie, and other respectable grammarians, an ingenious writer on the subject strenuously contends, that the definitions are erroneous. This critic says, that, in the following sentences, "A philosophical grammar, written by James Harris, Esquire;" "There

was a man, named John the Baptist;" "The Lord planted a garden eastward in Eden;" the article *a* is not, according to our definition of it, used in a vague sense, to point out one single thing of the kind, in other respects indeterminate. He asserts that, in these and similar instances, it is used in a determinate sense, to denote, in the most precise manner, a particular book, a particular man, and a particular garden. This conclusion of our critic we conceive to be totally unfounded. He supposes that the article, in the examples adduced, applies to the whole of the sentences, to the subsequent and explanatory parts, as well as to those which precede. But he is not warranted in this supposition. The real application of the article is solely to the words *philosophical grammar*, *man*, and *garden;* and it is therefore indeterminate. The circumstances which render the subjects precise and definite, are the subsequent explanations; which certainly do not alter or affect the grammatical nature of the article.

The mode of arguing adopted by this writer proves too much, and therefore nothing. Let us try its operation on other parts of speech. The words *some* and *other* are allowed to be indefinite pronouns; and the words *this* and *that* demonstrative pronouns*. But according to the reasoning of our opponent, these pronouns would alter their established nature, in such expressions as the following: "Some of the Roman emperors, namely, Tiberius, Caligula, and Nero, were extremely cruel and tyrannical:" "Other men, namely, Charles, James, and William, were present:" "This person, or some other, committed the fact:" "That man, or another, was an accomplice." On the new system, the words *some* and *other*, in these examples, would cease to be indefinite

* Whether these words are considered as pronouns or adjectives, the reasoning upon them is of equal validity.

pronouns; and the words *this* and *that*, would not be demonstrative; because the subjects in the first are ascertained, and in the second rendered uncertain, by the subsequent expressions. It is unquestionably false reasoning, to conclude that certain expressions cannot be of a definite, or of an indefinite nature, because it is possible, by the annexation of particular circumstances, to give them a different designation.

With regard to the definite article, our critic produces the following example, in support of his opinion; "Be not afraid ye beasts of the field;" and relying on its efficacy, he inquires, what particular field is here meant?—The answer is obvious. The particularity is as clearly denoted in this instance, as in the following phrases: "The boar out of the wood: Every beast of the forest: Fish of the sea; Beasts of the earth." The field, the wood, the forest, &c. are used by way of contradistinction, or to designate special or individual objects. These phrases are, therefore, perfectly consistent with our explanation of the nature and use of the definite article. Other modes of expression are adduced by our opponent, as favouring his opinion. Such as, "The tree beareth her fruit; The Fig-tree and the Vine do yield their strength:" and we are asked, "What particular tree? Does the article *the* point out the particular tree or vine?"—Here too we think the reply is not difficult. The Tree, the Fig-tree, and the Vine, may be justly considered, as a figure of speech putting a part for the whole, or as one species of things distinguished from others. We say, "The horse is a noble animal;" "The dog is a faithful creature:" meaning the species of animals called horse, or dog. This application of the definite article comports exactly with the definition: it ascertains what particular thing or things are meant.

Though we think that the arguments already advanced, are sufficient to support our definitions of the articles, it may not be improper further to observe, that after all which can be done, to render the definitions and rules of grammar comprehensive and accurate, men of learning and science know, that they generally admit of exceptions; that there are peculiar anomalies which belong to some of them; extreme cases which may be stated; and precise boundaries which cannot be ascertained. These, in the hands of men, more ingenious than candid, may be plausibly advanced against any system; and to those who are not thoroughly conversant in the art, may appear to be material imperfections, attributable to an author's work, and not to the nature of the subject.

CHAPTER III.

OF SUBSTANTIVES.

SECTION 1.

Of Substantives in general.

A SUBSTANTIVE or Noun is the name of any thing that exists, or of which we have any notion: as, *London, man, virtue.*

Substantives are either proper or common.

Proper names or substantives, are the names appropriated to individuals: as, George, London, Thames.

Common names or substantives, stand for kinds containing many sorts, or for sorts containing many individuals under them: as, animal, man, tree, &c.

When proper names have an article annexed to them, they are used as common names: as, "He is *the Cicero* of his age; he is reading the lives of *the* Twelve *Cæsars.*"

Common names may also be used to signify individuals, by the addition of articles or pronouns: as, "*The* boy is studious; *that* girl is discreet.*"

To substantives belong gender, number, and case; and they are all of the third person, when spoken *of*, and of the second, when spoken *to:* as, "Blessings attend us on every side; be grateful, children of men!" that is *ye* children of men.

* Nouns may also be divided into the following classes: *Collective* nouns, or nouns of multitude: as, the people, the parliament, the army: *Abstract* nouns, or the names of qualities abstracted from their substances: as, knowledge, goodness, whiteness: *Verbal* or *participial* nouns: as, beginning, reading, writing.

Section 2.

Of Gender.

Gender is the distinction of nouns, with regard to sex. There are three genders, the masculine, the feminine, and the neuter.

The Masculine Gender denotes animals of the male kind: as, a man, a horse, a bull.

The Feminine Gender signifies animals of the female kind: as, a woman, a duck, a hen.

The Neuter Gender denotes objects which are neither males nor females: as, a field, a house, a garden.

Some substantives, naturally neuter, are, by a figure of speech, converted into the masculine or feminine gender: as, when we say of the sun, *he* is setting; and of a ship, *she* sails well.

Figuratively, in the English tongue, we commonly give the masculine gender to nouns which are conspicuous for the attributes of imparting or communicating, and which are by nature strong and efficacious. Those, again, are made feminine, which are conspicuous for the attributes of containing, or bringing forth, or which are peculiarly beautiful or amiable. Upon these principles, the sun is said to be masculine; and the moon, being the receptacle of the sun's light, to be feminine. The earth is generally feminine. A ship, a country, a city, &c. are likewise made feminine, being receivers or containers. Time is always masculine, on account of its mighty efficacy. Virtue is feminine from its beauty, and its being the object of love. Fortune and the church, are generally put in the feminine gender.—There appears to be a rational foundation for these figurative distinctions, though they

have not been adopted in all countries. Many of the substances which, in one language, have masculine names, have, in others, names that are feminine.

Greek and Latin, and many of the modern tongues, have nouns, some masculine, some feminine, which denote substances where sex never had existence. Nay, some languages are so particularly defective in this respect, as to class every object, inanimate as well as animate, under either the masculine or the feminine gender, as they have no neuter gender for those which are of neither sex. This is the case with the Hebrew, French, Italian, and Spanish. But the English, strictly following the order of nature, puts every noun which denotes a male animal, and no other, in the *masculine* gender; every name of a female animal, in the *feminine;* and every animal whose sex is not obvious, or known, as well as every inanimate object whatever, in the *neuter* gender. And this gives our language a superior advantage to most others, in the poetical and rhetorical style: for when nouns naturally neuter are converted into masculine and feminine, the personification is more distinctly, and more forcibly marked.

The English language has three methods of distinguishing the sex, viz.

1. By different words: as,

Male.	Female.	Male.	Female.
Bachelor.	Maid.	Dog.	Bitch.
Boar.	Sow.	Drake.	Duck.
Boy.	Girl.	Earl.	Countess.
Brother.	Sister.	Father.	Mother.
Buck.	Doe.	Friar.	Nun.
Bull	Cow.	Gander.	Goose.
Bullock *or* Steer.	Heifer.	Hart.	Roe.
		Horse.	Mare.
Cock.	Hen.	Husband.	Wife.

Male.	Female.	Male.	Female.
King.	Queen.	Singer.	Songstress or Singer.
Lad.	Lass.		
Lord.	Lady.	Sloven.	Slut.
Man.	Woman.	Son.	Daughter.
Master.	Mistress.	Stag.	Hind.
Milter.	Spawner.	Uncle.	Aunt.
Nephew.	Niece.	Wizard.	Witch.
Ram.	Ewe.		

2. By a difference of termination: as,

Male.	Female.	Male.	Female.
Abbot.	Abbess.	Jew.	Jewess.
Actor.	Actress.	Landgrave.	Landgravine.
Administrator.	Administratrix.	Lion.	Lioness.
Adulterer.	Adultress.	Marquis.	Marchioness.
Ambassador.	Ambassadress.	Mayor.	Mayoress.
Arbiter.	Arbitress.	Patron.	Patroness.
Baron.	Baroness.	Peer.	Peeress.
Bridegroom.	Bride.	Poet.	Poetess.
Benefactor.	Benefactress.	Priest.	Priestess.
Caterer.	Cateress.	Prince.	Princess.
Chanter.	Chantress.	Prior.	Prioress.
Conductor.	Conductress.	Prophet.	Prophetess.
Count.	Countess.	Protector.	Protectress.
Deacon.	Deaconess.	Shepherd.	Shepherdess.
Duke.	Duchess.	Songster.	Songstress.
Elector.	Electress.	Sorcerer.	Sorceress.
Emperor.	Empress.	Sultan.	Sultaness. Sultana.
Enchanter.	Enchantress.		
Executor.	Executrix.	Tiger.	Tigress.
Governor.	Governess.	Traitor.	Traitress.
Heir.	Heiress.	Tutor.	Tutoress.
Hero.	Heroine.	Viscount.	Viscountess.
Hunter.	Huntress.	Votary.	Votaress.
Host.	Hostess.	Widower.	Widow.

3. By a noun, pronoun, or adjective, being *prefixed* to the substantive: as,

A cock-sparrow.	A hen-sparrow.
A man-servant.	A maid-servant.
A he-goat.	A she-goat.
A he-bear.	A she-bear.
A male child.	A female child.
Male descendants.	Female descendants.

It sometimes happens, that the same noun is either masculine or feminine. The words *parent*, *child*, *cousin*, *friend*, *neighbour*, *servant*, and several others, are used indifferently for males or females. These words cannot properly be said to denote a distinct species of gender, as some writers on English grammar have asserted, and who denominate them the *common* gender. There is no such gender belonging to the language. The business of parsing can be effectually performed, without having recourse to a *common* gender. Thus, we may say; *Parents* is a noun of the masculine *and* feminine gender; *Parent*, if doubtful, is of the masculine *or* feminine gender; and *Parent*, if the gender is known by the construction, is of the gender so ascertained.

Nouns with variable terminations contribute to conciseness and perspicuity of expression. We have only a sufficient number of them to make us feel our want: for when we say of a woman, she is a philosopher, an astronomer, a builder, a weaver, we perceive an impropriety in the termination, which we cannot avoid; but we can say, that she is a botanist, a student, a witness, a scholar, an orphan, a companion, because these terminations have not annexed to them the notion of sex.

Section 3.

Of Number.

Number is the consideration of an object, as one or more.

Substantives are of two numbers, the singular and the plural.

The singular number expresses but one object: as, a chair, a table.

The plural number signifies more objects than one: as, chairs, tables.

Some nouns, from the nature of the things which they express, are used only in the singular form: as, wheat, pitch, gold, sloth, pride, &c.; others, only in the plural form: as, bellows, scissors, ashes, riches, &c.

Some words are the same in both numbers: as, deer, sheep, swine, &c.

The plural number of nouns is generally formed by adding *s* to the singular: as, dove, doves; face, faces; thought, thoughts. But when the substantive singular ends in *x*, *ch* soft, *sh*, *ss*, or *s*, we add *es* in the plural: as, box, boxes; church, churches; lash, lashes; kiss, kisses; rebus, rebuses. If the singular ends in *ch* hard, the plural is formed by adding *s*: as, monarch, monarchs; distich, distichs.

Nouns which end in *o*, have sometimes *es* added, to form the plural: as, cargo, echo, hero, negro, manifesto, potato, volcano, wo: and sometimes only *s*; as, folio, nuncio, punctilio, seraglio.

Nouns ending in *f*, or *fe*, are rendered plural by the change of those terminations into *ves*: as, loaf, loaves; half, halves; wife, wives; except grief, relief, reproof, and several others, which form the plural by the addition of *s*. Those which end in *ff*, have the regular plural: as, ruff, ruffs; except, staff, staves.

Nouns which have *y* in the singular, with no other vowel in the same syllable, change it into *ies* in the plural: as, beauty, beauties; fly, flies. But the *y* is not changed, when there is another vowel in the syllable: as, key, keys; delay, delays; attorney, attorneys.

Some nouns become plural by changing the *a* of the singular into *e*: as, man, men; woman, women; alderman, aldermen. The words, ox and child, form oxen and children; brother, makes either brothers, or brethren. Sometimes the diphthong *oo* is changed into *ee* in the plural: as, foot, feet; goose, geese; tooth, teeth. Louse and mouse, make lice and mice. Penny, makes pence; or pennies, when the coin is meant; die, dice (for play); die, dies (for coining).

It is a general rule, that all names of things measured or weighed, have no plural; for in them not number, but quantity, is regarded: as, wool, wine, oil. When we speak, however, of different kinds, we use the plural: as, the coarser wools, the richer wines, the finer oils.

It is agreeable to analogy, and the practice of the generality of correct writers, to construe the following words as plural nouns: *pains*, *riches*, *alms*: and also, *mathematics*, *metaphysics*, *politics*, *ethics*, *optics*, *pneumatics*, with other similar names of sciences.

Dr. Johnson says, that the adjective *much* is sometimes a term of number, as well as of quantity. This may account for the instances we meet with of its associating with *pains* as a plural noun: as, "much pains." The connexion, however, is not to be recommended.

The word *news* is now almost universally considered as belonging to the singular number.

The noun *means* is used both in the singular and the plural number.

As a general rule for the use of the word *means*, as either singular or plural, it would render the construction less vague, and the expression therefore less ambiguous, were we to employ it as singular, when the mediation or instrumentality of one thing is implied; and, as plural, when two or more mediating causes are referred to. "He was careful to observe what means *were* employed by his adversaries, to counteract his schemes." Here *means* is properly joined with a plural verb, several methods of counteraction being signified. "The king consented; and, by *this* means, all hope of success was lost." Here but one mediating circumstance is implied; and the noun is, therefore, used as singular.

The following words,
which have been adopted from the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages,
are thus distinguished, with respect to number.

Singular.	Plural.	Singular.	Plural.
Cherub.	Cherubim.	Phœnomenon.	Phœnomena.
Seraph.	Seraphim.	Appendix.	Appendices *or* Appendixes.
Antithesis.	Antitheses.		
Automaton.	Automata.	Arcanum.	Arcana.
Basis.	Bases.	Axis.	Axes.
Crisis.	Crises.	Calx.	Calces.
Criterion.	Criteria.	Datum.	Data.
Diæresis.	Diæreses.	Effluvium.	Effluvia.
Ellipsis.	Ellipses.	Encomium.	Encomia *or* Encomiums.
Emphasis.	Emphases.		
Hypothesis.	Hypotheses.	Erratum.	Errata.
Metamorphosis.	Metamorphoses.	Genius.	Genii *.

* *Genii*, when denoting aërial spirits: *Geniuses*, when signifying persons of genius.

Singular.	Plural.	Singular.	Plural.
Genus.	Genera.	Memorandum.	Memoranda *or* Memorandums.
Index.	Indices *or* Indexes*.	Radius.	Radii.
Lamina.	Laminæ.	Stamen.	Stamina.
Medium.	Media.	Stratum.	Strata.
Magus.	Magi.	Vortex.	Vortices.

Some words, derived from the learned languages, are confined to the plural number: as, antipodes, credenda, literati, minutiæ.

The following nouns being, in Latin, both singular and plural, are used in the same manner, when adopted into our tongue: hiatus, apparatus, series, species.

SECTION 4.

Of Case.

IN English, substantives have three cases, the nominative, the possessive, and the objective†.

The nominative case simply expresses the name of a thing, or the subject of the verb: as, "The boy plays;" "The girls learn."

The possessive case expresses the relation of property or possession; and has an apostrophe with the letter *s* coming after it: as, "The scholar's duty;" "My father's house."

---

* *Indexes,* when it signifies pointers, or Tables of contents: *Indices,* when referring to Algebraic quantities.

† The possessive is sometimes called the genitive case; and the objective, the accusative.

When the plural ends in *s*, the other *s* is omitted, but the apostrophe is retained: as, "On eagles' wings;" "The drapers' company*."

Sometimes also, when the singular terminates in *ss*, the apostrophic *s* is not added: as, "For goodness' sake;" "For righteousness' sake."

The objective case expresses the object of an action, or of a relation; and generally follows a verb active, or a preposition: as, "John assists Charles;" "They live in London."

English substantives are declined in the following manner.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nominative Case.	A mother.	Mothers.
Possessive Case.	A mother's	Mothers'.
Objective Case.	A mother.	Mothers.
Nominative Case.	The man.	The men.
Possessive Case.	The man's	The men's
Objective Case.	The man.	The men.

The English language, to express different connexions and relations of one thing to another, uses, for the most part, prepositions. The Greek and Latin among the ancient, and some too among the modern languages, as,

* As a proof of the utility of marking the genitive plural with the apostrophe, we need recur only to a few common phrases.

All the ships masts were blown away.
All the trees leaves were blown off.

In these, and similar phrases, it is only the apostrophe, placed before or after the *s*, that determines the ships and trees to be either singular or plural.

the German, vary the termination or ending of the substantive, to answer the same purpose; an example of which, in the Latin, is inserted, as explanatory of the nature and use of cases, viz.

	Singular.	
Nominative.	DOMINUS,	A Lord.
Genitive.	DOMINI,	Lord's, of a Lord.
Dative.	DOMINO,	To a Lord.
Accusative.	DOMINUM,	A Lord.
Vocative.	DOMINE,	O Lord.
Ablative.	DOMINO,	By a Lord.

	Plural.	
Nominative.	DOMINI,	Lords.
Genitive.	DOMINORUM,	Lords', of Lords.
Dative.	DOMINIS,	To Lords.
Accusative.	DOMINOS,	Lords.
Vocative.	DOMINI,	O Lords.
Ablative.	DOMINIS,	By Lords.

Some writers think, that the relations signified by the addition of articles and prepositions to the noun, may properly be denominated cases, in English; and that, on this principle, there are, in our language, as many cases as in the Latin tongue. But to this mode of forming cases for our substantives, there are strong objections. It would, indeed, be a formal and useless arrangement of nouns, articles, and prepositions. If an arrangement of this nature were to be considered as constituting cases, the English language would have a much greater number of them, than the Greek and Latin tongues: for, as every preposition has its distinct meaning and effect, every combination of a preposition and article with the noun, would form a different relation, and would constitute a distinct case. This would encumber our language with

many new terms, and a heavy and useless load of distinctions*.

On the principle of imitating other languages in names and forms, without a correspondence in nature and idiom, we might adopt a number of declensions, as well as a variety of cases, for English substantives. Thus, five or six declensions, distinguished according to the various modes of forming the plural of substantives, with at least half a dozen cases to each declension, would furnish a complete arrangement of English nouns, in all their trappings. See on this subject *the fifth and ninth sections of the sixth chapter* of Etymology.

But though this variety of cases does not at all correspond with the idiom of our language, there seems to be great propriety in admitting a case in English substantives, which shall serve to denote the *objects* of active verbs and of prepositions; and which is, therefore, properly termed the *objective case*. The general idea of case, doubtless, has a reference to the termination of the noun: but there are many instances, both in Greek and Latin, in which the nominative and accusative cases have precisely the same form, and are distinguished only by the relation they bear to other words in the sentence. We are therefore warranted by analogy, in applying this principle to our own language, as far as utility, and the idiom of it, will admit. Now it is obvious, that in English, a noun governed by an active verb, or a preposition, is very differently circumstanced, from a noun in the nomi-

---

* "If cases are to be distinguished by the different significations of the noun, or by the different relations it may bear to the governing word, then we have in our language as many cases almost, as there are prepositions: and, above a man, beneath a man, beyond a man, round about a man, within a man, without a man, &c. shall be cases, as well as, of a man, to a man, and with a man." *Dr. Beattie.*

native, or in the possessive case; and that a comprehensive case, correspondent to that difference, must be useful and proper. The business of parsing, and of showing the connexion and dependence of words, will be most conveniently accomplished, by the adoption of such a case; and the irregularity of having our nouns sometimes placed in a situation, in which they cannot be said to be in any case at all, will be avoided.

The author of this work long doubted the propriety, of assigning to English substantives an objective case: but a renewed, critical examination of the subject; an examination to which he was prompted by the extensive and increasing demand for the grammar, has produced in his mind a full persuasion, that the nouns of our language are entitled to this comprehensive objective case.

When the thing to which another is said to belong, is expressed by a circumlocution, or by many terms, the sign of the possessive case is commonly added to the last term: as, "The king of Great Britain's dominions."

Sometimes, though rarely, two nouns in the possessive case, immediately succeed each other, in the following form: "My friend's wife's sister;" a sense which would be better expressed by saying, "the sister of my friend's wife;" or, "My friend's sister in law." Some grammarians say, that in each of the following phrases, viz. "A book of my brother's," "A servant of the queen's," "A soldier of the king's," there are two genitive cases; the first phrase implying, "one of the books of my brother," the next, "one of the servants of the queen;" and the last, "one of the soldiers of the king." But as the preposition governs the objective case; and as there are not, in each of these sentences, two apostrophes with the letter *s* coming after them, we cannot with propriety say, that there are two genitive cases.

CHAPTER IV.

ADJECTIVES.

SECTION 1.

Of the nature of Adjectives, and the degrees of comparison.

AN Adjective is a word added to a substantive, to express its quality: as, "An *industrious* man;" "A *virtuous* woman;" "A *benevolent* mind."

In English, the adjective is not varied on account of gender, number, or case. Thus we say, "A careless boy; careless girls."

The only variation which it admits, is that of the degrees of comparison.

There are commonly reckoned three degrees of comparison; the POSITIVE, the COMPARATIVE, and the SUPERLATIVE.

GRAMMARIANS have generally enumerated these three degrees of comparison; but the first of them has been thought by some writers, to be, improperly, termed a degree of comparison; as it seems to be nothing more than the simple form of the adjective, and not to imply either comparison or degree. This opinion may be well founded, unless the adjective be supposed to imply comparison or degree, by containing a secret or general reference to other things: as, when we say, "he is a *tall* man," "this a *fair* day," we make some reference to the ordinary size of men, and to different weather.

The Positive State expresses the quality of an object, without any increase or diminution: as, good, wise, great.

The Comparative Degree increases or lessens the positive in signification: as, wiser, greater, less wise.

The Superlative Degree increases or lessens the positive to the highest or lowest degree: as, wisest, greatest, least wise.

The simple word, or positive, becomes the comparative, by adding *r* or *er;* and the superlative, by adding *st* or *est,* to the end of it: as, wise, wiser, wisest; great, greater, greatest. And the adverbs *more* and *most,* placed before the adjective, have the same effect: as, wise, *more* wise, *most* wise.

THE termination *ish* may be accounted in some sort a degree of comparison, by which the signification is diminished below the positive: as, *black, blackish,* or tending to blackness; *salt, saltish,* or having a little taste of salt.

The word *rather* is very properly used to express a small degree or excess of a quality: as, "she is *rather* profuse in her expenses."

Monosyllables, for the most part, are compared by *er* and *est;* and dissyllables by *more* and *most:* as, mild, milder, mildest; frugal, more frugal, most frugal. Dissyllables ending in *y;* as, happy, lovely; and in *le* after a mute, as able, ample; or accented on the last syllable, as, discreet, polite; easily admit of *er* and *est:* as, happier, happiest; abler, ablest; politer, politest. Words of more than two syllables hardly ever admit of those terminations.

In some words the superlative is formed by adding the adverb *most* to the end of them: as, nethermost, uttermost or utmost; undermost, uppermost, foremost.

In English, as in most languages, there are some words of very common use, (in which the caprice of custom is apt to get the better of analogy,) that are irregular in this respect: as, "good, better, best; bad, worse, worst; little, less, least; much or many, more, most; near, nearer, nearest or next; late, later, latest or last; old, older or elder, oldest or eldest;" and a few others.

An adjective put without a substantive, with the definite article before it, becomes a substantive in sense and meaning, and is written as a substantive: as, "Providence rewards *the good*, and punishes *the bad*."

Various nouns placed before other nouns assume the nature of adjectives: as, sea fish, wine vessel, corn field, meadow ground, &c.

Numeral adjectives are either cardinal, or ordinal: cardinal, as one, two, three, &c.; ordinal, as first, second, third, &c.

SECTION 2.

Remarks on the subject of Comparison.

IF we consider the subject of comparison attentively, we shall perceive that the degrees of it are infinite in number, or at least indefinite. The following instances will illustrate this position.—A mountain is larger than a mite;—by how many degrees? How much bigger is the earth than a grain of sand? By how many degrees was Socrates wiser than Alcibiades? or by how many is snow whiter than this paper? It is plain, that to these, and many other questions of a similar nature, no *definite* answers can be returned.

In quantities, however, that may be *exactly* measured, the degrees of excess may be exactly ascertained. A foot is just twelve times as long as an inch; and an hour is sixty times the length of a minute. But, in regard to *qualities*, and to those quantities which cannot be measured exactly, it is impossible to say how many degrees may be comprehended in the comparative excess.

But though these degrees are infinite or indefinite in fact, they cannot be so in language: it is not possible to accommodate our speech to such numberless gradations; nor would it be convenient, if language were to express many of them. In regard to unmeasured quantities and qualities, the degrees of more and less, (besides those marked above,) may be expressed intelligibly, at least, if not accurately, by certain adverbs, or words of like import: as, "Virtue is *greatly* preferable to riches;" "Socrates was *much* wiser than Alcibiades;" "Snow is *a great deal* whiter than this paper;" "The tide is *considerably* higher to-day than it was yesterday;" "Epaminondas was *by far* the most accomplished of the Thebans;" "The evening star is a *very* splendid object, but the sun is *incomparably* more splendid;" "The Deity is *infinitely* greater than the greatest of his creatures." The inaccuracy of these, and the like expressions, is not a material inconvenience; and, if it were, it is unavoidable: for human speech can only express human thought; and where thought is necessarily inaccurate, language must be so too.

When the word *very, exceedingly,* or any other of similar import, is put before the positive, it is called by some writers the superlative of eminence, to distinguish it from the other superlative, which has been already mentioned, and is called the superlative of comparison. Thus *very eloquent*, is termed the superlative of eminence;

most eloquent, the superlative of comparison. In the superlative of eminence, something of comparison is, however, remotely or indirectly intimated; for we cannot reasonably call a man very eloquent, without comparing his eloquence with the eloquence of other men.

The comparative may be so employed, as to express the same pre-eminence or inferiority as the superlative. Thus, the sentence, "Of all acquirements, virtue is the *most valuable*," conveys the same sentiment as the following: "Virtue is *more valuable* than every other acquirement."

When we properly use the comparative degree, the objects compared are set in *direct opposition*, and the one is not considered as a part of the other, or as comprehended under it. If I say, "Cicero was more eloquent than the Romans," I speak absurdly; because it is well known, that of the class of men expressed by the word *Romans*, Cicero was one. But when I assert that "Cicero was more eloquent than all the *other* Romans, or, than any other *Roman*;" I do not speak absurdly: for though the persons spoken of were all of the same class or city, yet Cicero is here set in contradistinction to the rest of his countrymen, and is not considered as one of the persons with whom he is compared.—Moreover, if the Psalmist had said, "I am the wisest of my teachers," the phrase would have been improper, because it would imply that he was one of his teachers. But when he says, "I am wiser than my teachers," he does not consider himself as one of them, but places himself in contradistinction to them. So also, in the expression, "Eve was the fairest of her daughters," the same species of impropriety is manifest; since the phrase supposes, that Eve was one of her own daughters.—Again, in the sentence, "Solomon was the wisest of men," Solomon is compared with a kind of beings, of whom he himself was one, and therefore the superlative is used. But the

expression, "Solomon was of all men the wiser," is not sense: because the use of the comparative would imply, that Solomon was set in opposition to mankind; which is so far from being the case, that he is expressly considered as one of the species.

As there are some qualities which admit of comparison, so there are others which admit of none. Such, for example, are those which denote that quality of bodies arising from their figure: as when we say, "A *circular* table; a *quadrangular* court; a *conical* piece of metal," &c. The reason is, that a million of things participating the same figure, participate it equally, if they do it at all. To say, therefore, that while A and B are both quadrangular, A is more or less quadrangular than B, is absurd. The same holds true in all attributives denoting *definite quantities*, of whatever nature. Thus the *two-foot* rule C cannot be *more a two-foot* rule, than any other of the same length. For as there can be no comparison without *intension* or *remission*, and as there can be no intension or remission in *things always definite*, these attributives can admit of no comparison. By the same method of reasoning, we discover the cause why no substantive is susceptible of these degrees of comparison. A mountain cannot be said more to be, or to exist, than a molehill; but the more or less must be sought for in their qualities.

CHAPTER V.

OF PRONOUNS.

A PRONOUN is a word used instead of a noun, to avoid the too frequent repetition of the same word: as, "The man is happy; *he* is benevolent; *he* is useful*."

There are three kinds of pronouns, viz. the PERSONAL, the RELATIVE, and the ADJECTIVE PRONOUNS.

SECTION 1.

Of the Personal Pronouns.

THERE are five Personal Pronouns, viz. *I, thou, he, she, it*; with their plurals, *we, ye* or *you, they*.

Personal Pronouns admit of person, number, gender, and case.

The persons of pronouns are three in each number, viz.

I, is the first person *Thou*, is the second person *He*, *she*, or *it*, is the third person	Singular.
We, is the first person *Ye* or *you*, is the second person *They*, is the third person	Plural.

---

* The pronoun is also used to represent an adjective, a sentence, a part of a sentence, and sometimes even a series of propositions: as, "They supposed him to be *innocent*, *which* he certainly was not." "His friend bore the abuse very patiently; *which* served to increase his rudeness: *it* produced, at length, contempt and insolence."

THIS account of persons will be very intelligible, when we reflect, that there are three persons who may be the subject of any discourse: first, the person who speaks, may speak of himself; secondly, he may speak of the person to whom he addresses himself; thirdly, he may speak of some other person: and as the speakers, the persons spoken to, and the other persons spoken of, may be many, so each of these persons must have the plural number.

The numbers of pronouns, like those of substantives, are two, the singular and the plural: as, *I, thou, he; we, ye* or *you, they.*

Gender has respect only to the third person singular of the pronouns, *he, she, it.* *He* is masculine; *she* is feminine; *it* is neuter.

THE persons speaking and spoken to, being at the same time the subjects of the discourse, are supposed to be present; from which, and other circumstances, their sex is commonly known, and needs not to be marked by a distinction of gender in the pronouns: but the third person or thing spoken of, being absent, and in many respects unknown, it is necessary that it should be marked by a distinction of gender; at least, when some particular person or thing is spoken of, that ought to be more distinctly marked: accordingly, the pronoun singular of the third person has the three genders, *he, she, it.*

Pronouns have three cases; the nominative, the possessive, and the objective.

The objective case of a pronoun has, in general, a form different from that of the nominative, or the possessive case.

The personal pronouns are thus declined:

Person.	Case.	Singular.	Plural.
First.	*Nom.*	I.	We.
	Poss.	Mine.	Ours.
	Obj.	Me.	Us.
Second.	*Nom.*	Thou.	Ye *or* you.
	Poss.	Thine.	Yours.
	Obj.	Thee.	You.
Third.	*Nom.*	He.	They.
Mas.	*Poss.*	His.	Theirs.
	Obj.	Him.	Them.
Third.	*Nom.*	She.	They.
Fem.	*Poss.*	Hers.	Theirs.
	Obj.	Her.	Them.
Third.	*Nom.*	It.	They.
Neuter.	*Poss.*	Its.	Theirs.
	Obj.	It.	Them.

THE propriety of admitting *his*, *hers*, *ours*, *yours*, &c. as possessive cases of the personal pronouns, has been disputed, though the nature and meaning of these words, and the concurrent practice of our first grammarians, have assigned them this rank and denomination. It has been alleged, that these supposed possessives are actually used in the nominative and objective cases; and that therefore our classification must be erroneous. The instances offered in support of this allegation, are such as the following: "My pleasures are past; *hers* and *yours* are to come:" "They applauded his conduct, but condemned *hers* and *yours*." A little reflection will, how-

ever, show that these pronouns, in the examples produced, are not in the nominative and objective cases, but in the possessive case. The following appears to be the true construction of these sentences: "My pleasures are past; the pleasures *of her* and *of you* are to come:" "They applauded his conduct, but condemned the conduct *of her* and *of you*." That this is the right construction will more clearly appear, if we substitute nouns for the pronouns: "My pleasures are past; Mary's and Ann's are to come:" "They applauded his conduct, but condemned Mary's and Ann's:" that is, "Mary's and Ann's pleasures; Mary's and Ann's conduct."

The objection too, that the phrase, "An acquaintance *of yours*," supposes the same word to admit of two different signs of the case, seems to be of no validity. Instances of a double genitive, as it is called, are not uncommon in our language, and they are far from implying any absurdity. We properly say, "An acquaintance *of Peter's*;" "A soldier *of the king's*."—See Syntax, Rule x. Note 6.

The possessives under consideration, like other parts of grammar, may indeed have some properties peculiar to themselves; and may not, in their present form, be readily accommodated to every circumstance belonging to the possessive cases of nouns: but they should not, on this slight pretence, be dispossessed of the right and privilege, which, from time immemorial, they have enjoyed.

Section 2.

Of the Relative Pronouns.

Relative Pronouns are such as relate, in general, to some word or phrase going before, which is thence called the antecedent: they are, *who*,

which, and *that*: as, "The man is happy *who* lives virtuously*."

What is a kind of compound relative, including both the antecedent and the relative, and is equivalent to *that which*: as, "This is *what* I wanted;" that is to say, "*the thing which* I wanted."

Who is applied to persons, *which* to animals and inanimate things: as, "He is a *friend*, *who* is faithful in adversity;" "The *bird*, *which* sung so sweetly, is flown;" "This is the *tree*, *which* produces no fruit."

That, as a relative, is often used to prevent the too frequent repetition of *who* and *which*. It is applied to both persons and things: as, "*He that* acts wisely deserves praise;" "Modesty is a *quality that* highly adorns a woman."

Who is of both numbers, and is thus declined:

Singular and Plural.

Nominative.	Who.
Possessive.	Whose.
Objective.	Whom.

Which, *that*, and *what*, are likewise of both numbers, but they do not vary their termination; except that *whose* is sometimes used as the possessive case of *which*: as, "Is there any other doctrine *whose* followers are punished?"

...."And the fruit
Of that forbidden *tree*, *whose* mortal taste
Brought death." MILTON.

---

* The relative pronoun, when used interrogatively, relates to a word or phrase, which is not *antecedent*, but *subsequent*, to the relative. See note under the VI. Rule of Syntax.

......" Pure the joy without allay,
Whose very rapture is tranquillity." YOUNG.

" The lights and shades, *whose* well accorded strife
Gives all the strength and colour of our life." POPE.

"This is one of the clearest characteristics of its being a religion *whose* origin is divine." BLAIR.

By the use of this license, one word is substituted for three: as, " Philosophy, *whose* end is to instruct us in the knowledge of nature," for, " Philosophy, *the* end *of which* is to instruct us," &c.

Who, which, and *what,* have sometimes the words *soever* and *ever* annexed to them: as, " *whosoever* or *whoever, whichsoever* or *whichever, whatsoever* or *whatever:*" but they are seldom used in modern style.

The word *that* is sometimes a relative, sometimes a demonstrative pronoun, and sometimes a conjunction. It is a relative, when it may be turned into *who* or *which* without destroying the sense: as, " *They* that (who) reprove us, may be our best friends;" " From every thing *that* (which) you see, derive instruction." It is a demonstrative pronoun when it is followed immediately by a substantive, to which it is either joined, or refers, and which it limits or qualifies: as, " *That* boy is industrious;" " *That* belongs to me;" meaning, that book, that desk, &c. It is a conjunction, when it joins sentences together, and cannot be turned into *who* or *which,* without destroying the sense: as, " Take care *that* every day be well employed." " I hope he will believe *that* I have not acted improperly."

Who, which, and *what,* are called *Interrogatives,* when they are used in asking questions: as, " *Who* is he?" " *Which* is the book?" " *What* are you doing?"

Whether was formerly made use of to signify interrogation: as, " *Whether* of these shall I choose?" but it is now seldom used, the interrogative *which* being substituted for

it. Some grammarians think that the use of it should be revived, as, like *either* and *neither* it points to the dual number; and would contribute to render our expressions concise and definite.

Some writers have classed the interrogatives as a separate kind of pronouns: but they are too nearly related to the relative pronouns, both in nature and form, to render such a division proper. They do not, in fact, lose the character of relatives, when they become interrogatives. The only difference is, that *without* an interrogation, the relatives have reference to a subject which is antecedent, definite, and known; *with* an interrogation, to a subject which is subsequent, indefinite, and unknown, and which it is expected that the *answer* should express and ascertain.

Section 3.

Of the Adjective Pronouns.

Adjective Pronouns are of a mixed nature, participating the properties both of pronouns and adjectives.

The adjective pronouns may be subdivided into four sorts: namely, the *possessive*, the *distributive*, the *demonstrative*, and the *indefinite*.

1. The *possessive* are those which relate to possession or property. There are seven of them; viz. *my*, *thy*, *his*, *her*, *our*, *your*, *their*.

Mine and *thine*, instead of *my* and *thy*, were formerly used before a substantive, or adjective, beginning with a vowel, or a silent *h*: as, "Blot out all *mine* iniquities."

The pronouns, *his*, *mine*, *thine*, have the same form, whether they are possessive pronouns, or the possessive cases of their respective personal pronouns. See Syntax, Rule x.

A few examples will probably assist the learner, to distinguish the possessive pronouns from the genitive cases of their correspondent personal pronouns.

The following sentences exemplify the possessive pronouns.—"*My* lesson is finished; *Thy* books are defaced; He loves *his* studies; She performs *her* duty; We own *our* faults; *Your* situation is distressing; I admire *their* virtues."

The following are examples of the possessive cases of the personal pronouns. "This desk is *mine;* the other is *thine;* These trinkets are *his;* those are *hers;* This house is *ours,* and that is *yours; Theirs* is very commodious."

Some grammarians consider *its* as a possessive pronoun.

The two words *own* and *self,* are used in conjunction with pronouns. *Own* is added to possessives, both singular and plural: as, "*My own* hand, *our own* house." It is emphatical, and implies a silent contrariety or opposition: as, "I live in *my own* house," that is, "not in a hired house." *Self* is added to possessives: as, *myself, yourselves:* and sometimes to personal pronouns: as, *himself, itself, themselves.* It then, like *own,* expresses emphasis and opposition: as, "I did this myself," that is, "not another;" or it forms a reciprocal pronoun: as, "We hurt ourselves by vain rage."

Himself, themselves, are now used in the nominative case, instead of *hisself, theirselves:* as, "He came himself;" "He himself shall do this;" "They performed it themselves."

2. The *distributive* are those, which denote the persons or things that make up a number, as taken separately and singly. They are *each, every, either:* as, "*Each* of his brothers is in a favourable situation;" "*Every* man must account for himself;" "I have not seen *either* of them."

Each relates to two or more persons or things, and signifies, either of the two, or every one of any number taken separately.

Every relates to several persons or things, and signifies each one of them all, taken separately. This pronoun was formerly used apart from its noun; but it is now constantly annexed to it, except in legal proceedings: as, in the phrase, "all and *every* of them."

Either relates to two persons or things taken separately, and signifies, the one or the other. To say, "either of the three," is therefore improper. It should be, "any of the three."

Neither imports "*not either;*" that is, not one nor the other: as, "Neither of my friends was there." If more than two are alluded to, it should be, "None of my friends was there."

3. The *demonstrative* are those, which precisely point out the subjects to which they relate: *this* and *that*, *these* and *those*, are of this class: as, "*This* is true charity; *that* is only its image."

This refers to the nearest person or thing, and *that* to the most distant: as, "*This* man is more intelligent than *that*." *This* indicates the latter, or last mentioned; *that*, the former, or first mentioned: as, "Both wealth and poverty are temptations; *that*, tends to excite pride, *this*, discontent."

Perhaps the words *former* and *latter* may be properly ranked amongst the demonstrative pronouns, especially in many of their applications. The following sentence may serve as an example: "It was happy for the state, that Fabius continued in the command with Minucius: the *former's* phlegm was a check upon the *latter's* vivacity."

4. The *indefinite* are those, which express their subjects in an indefinite or general manner. The following are of this kind: *some, other, any, one, all, such*, &c.

Of these pronouns, only the words *one* and *other* are varied. *One* has a possessive case, which it forms in the same manner as substantives: as, *one, one's*. This word has a general signification, meaning people at large; and sometimes also a peculiar reference to the person who is speaking: as, "*One* ought to pity the distresses of mankind." "*One* is apt to love *one's* self." This word is often used, by good writers, in the plural number: as, "The great *ones* of the world; "The boy wounded the old bird, and stole the young *ones*:" "My wife and the little *ones* are in good health."

Other is declined in the following manner:

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	*Other*	*Others.*
Poss.	*Other's*	*Others'.*
Obj.	*Other.*	*Others.*

The plural *others* is only used when apart from the noun to which it refers, whether expressed or understood: as, "When you have perused these papers, I will send you the *others*." "He pleases some, but he disgusts *others*." When this pronoun is joined to nouns, either singular or plural, it has no variation: as, "the other man," "the other men."

The following phrases may serve to exemplify the indefinite pronouns. "*Some* of you are wise and good;" "A few of them were idle, the *others* industrious;" "Neither is there *any* that is unexceptionable;" "*One* ought to know *one's* own mind;" "They were *all* present;" "*Such*

is the state of man, that he is never at rest;" "*Some* are happy, while *others* are miserable."

The word *another* is composed of the indefinite article prefixed to the word *other*.

None is used in both numbers: as, "*None* is so deaf as he that will not hear;" "*None* of those are equal to these." It seems originally to have signified, according to its derivation, *not one*, and therefore to have had no plural; but there is good authority for the use of it in the plural number: as, "*None* that *go* unto her *return* again." *Prov.* ii. 19. "Terms of peace *were none* vouchsaf'd." MILTON. "*None* of them *are* varied to express the gender." "*None* of them *have* different endings for the numbers." LOWTH'S *Introduction*. "*None* of their productions *are* extant." BLAIR.

We have endeavoured to explain the nature of the adjective pronouns, and to distinguish and arrange them intelligibly: but it is difficult, perhaps impracticable, to define and divide them in a manner perfectly unexceptionable. Some of them, in particular, may seem to require a different arrangement. We presume, however, that, for every useful purpose, the present classification is sufficiently correct. All the pronouns, except the personal and relative, may indeed, in a general view of them, be considered as *definitive* pronouns, because they define or ascertain the extent of the common name, or general term, to which they refer, or are joined; but as each class of them does this, more or less exactly, or in a manner peculiar to itself, a division adapted to this circumstance appears to be suitable to the nature of things, and the understanding of learners.

It is the opinion of some respectable grammarians, that the words *this*, *that*, *any*, *some*, *such*, *his*, *their*, *our*, &c. are pronouns, when they are used separately from the nouns to which they relate; but that, when they are joined to those nouns, they are not to be considered as

belonging to this species of words; because, in this association, they rather ascertain a substantive, than supply the place of one. They assert that, in the phrases, "give me *that*," "*this* is John's," and "*such* were *some* of you," the words in italics are pronouns; but that, in the following phrases, they are not pronouns; "*this* book is instructive," "*some* boys are ingenious," "*my* health is declining," "*our* hearts are deceitful," &c. Other grammarians think, that all these words are pure adjectives, and that none of them can properly be called pronouns; as the genuine pronoun stands by itself, without the aid of a noun expressed or understood. They are of opinion, that in the expressions, "Give me that;" "this is John's," &c. the noun is always understood, and must be supplied in the mind of the reader: as, "Give me *that book*;" "*this book* is John's;" "and *such persons* were *some persons* amongst you."

Some writers are of opinion, that the pronouns should be classed into *substantive* and *adjective* pronouns. Under the former, they include the personal and the relative; under the latter, all the others. But this division, though a neat one, does not appear to be accurate. All the relative pronouns will not range under the substantive head.—We have distributed these parts of grammar, in the mode which we think most correct and intelligible: but, for the information of students, and to direct their inquiries on the subject, we state the different opinions of several judicious writers on Grammar.

Some grammarians have considered the articles, and all the adjective pronouns, as pure adjectives. Others have proceeded so far as to class even the relative pronouns, or some of them, among the adjectives. Others again have placed the pronouns *this*, *that*, *other*, *some*, *any*, &c. in the rank of articles. It would, indeed, be difficult to state, within a moderate compass, the various opinions, and the ingenious discussions in support of them, which gram-

marians have exhibited, respecting these parts of speech, and their occasional conformity with each other. But arrangements of this kind, are not likely to be of any use, or to meet with general approbation. An adherence to the established terms and arrangement, produces many advantages, and occasions no material inconvenience. It is easy to advance plausible objections against almost every definition, rule, and arrangement of grammar. But in most cases of this nature, it is certainly much better, to supply the defects and abridge superfluities, to correct errors, and suggest improvements, by occasional notes and observations, than by disorganizing, or altering, a system which has been so long established, and so *generally approved**.—See page 65, 66, and Chapter xi. Section 1. On "Derivation."

---

* It is probable, that any attempt to establish a different classification of the parts of speech, from that which is commonly received, will be found of little utility, either in practice or in speculation.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA.

CHAPTER VI.

OF VERBS.

SECTION 1.

Of the nature of Verbs in general.

A VERB is a word which signifies to BE, to DO, or to SUFFER: as, "I am, I rule, I am ruled."

Verbs are of three kinds; ACTIVE, PASSIVE, and NEUTER. They are also divided into REGULAR, IRREGULAR, and DEFECTIVE.

A Verb Active expresses an action, and necessarily implies an agent, and an object acted upon: as, to love; "I love Penelope."

A Verb Passive expresses a passion, or a suffering, or the receiving of an action; and necessarily implies an object acted upon, and an agent by which it is acted upon: as, to be loved; "Penelope is loved by me."

A Verb neuter expresses neither action nor passion, but being, or a state of being: as, "I am, I sleep, I sit*."

---

* Verbs have been distinguished by some writers, into the following kinds.

1st. *Active-transitive*, or those which denote an action that passes from the agent to some object: as, Cæsar conquered Pompey.

2d. *Active-intransitive*, or those which express that kind of action, which has no effect upon any thing beyond the agent himself: as, Cæsar walked.

3d. *Passive*, or those which express, not action, but passion, whether pleasing or painful: as, Portia was loved; Pompey was conquered.

4th. *Neuter*,

THE verb active is also called *transitive*, because the action passes over to the object, or has an effect upon some other thing: as, "The tutor instructs his pupils;" "I esteem the man."

Verbs neuter may properly be denominated *intransitives*, because the effect is confined within the subject, and does not pass over to any object: as, "I sit, he lives, they sleep."

Some of the verbs that are usually ranked among neuters, make a near approach to the nature of a verb active; but they may be distinguished from it by their being intransitive: as, to run, to walk, to fly, &c. The rest are more obviously neuter, and more clearly expressive of a middle state between action and passion: as, to stand, to lie, to sleep, &c.

In English, many verbs are used both in an active and a neuter signification, the construction only determining of which kind they are: as, to flatten, signifying to make even or level, is a verb active; but when it signifies to grow dull or insipid, it is a verb neuter.

A neuter verb, by the addition of a preposition, may become a compound active verb. *To smile* is a neuter verb: it cannot, therefore, be followed by an objective case, nor be construed as a passive verb. We cannot say, *she smiled him*, or *he was smiled*. But *to smile on* being a compound active verb, we properly say, *she smiled on him; he was smiled on* by fortune in every undertaking.

4th. *Neuter*, or those which express an attribute that consists neither in action nor passion: as, Cæsar stood.

This appears to be an orderly arrangement. But if the class of *active-intransitive* verbs were admitted, it would rather perplex than assist the learner: for the difference between verbs active and neuter, as transitive and intransitive, is easy and obvious; but the difference between verbs absolutely neuter and intransitively active, is not always clear. It is, indeed, often very difficult, if not impossible, to be ascertained.

Auxiliary or helping Verbs, are those by the help of which the English verbs are principally conjugated. They are, *do, be, have, shall, will, may, can,* with their variations; and *let* and *must,* which have no variation *.

In our definition of the verb, as a part of speech which signifies *to be, to do,* or *to suffer,* &c. we have included every thing, either expressly or by necessary consequence, that is essential to its nature, and nothing that is not essential to it. This definition is warranted by the authority of Dr. Lowth, and of many other respectable writers on grammar. There are, however, some grammarians, who consider *assertion* as the essence of the verb. But, as the participle and the infinitive, if included in it, would prove insuperable objections to their scheme, they have, without hesitation, denied the former a place in the verb, and declared the latter to be merely an abstract noun. This appears to be going rather too far in support of an hypothesis. It seems to be incumbent on these grammarians, to reject also the imperative mood. What part of speech would they make the verbs in the following sentence? "Depart instantly: improve your time: forgive us our sins." Will it be said, that the verbs in these phrases are assertions?

In reply to these questions, it has been said, that "Depart instantly," is an expression equivalent to, "I desire you to depart instantly;" and that as the latter phrase implies affirmation or assertion, so does the former. But, supposing the phrases to be exactly alike in sense, the reasoning is not conclusive. 1st. In the latter phrase,

* *Let* as a principal verb, has *lettest* and *letteth;* but as a helping verb it admits of no variation.

the only part implying affirmation, is, "I desire." The words, "to depart," are in the infinitive mood, and contain no assertion: they affirm nothing. 2d. The position is not tenable, that "Equivalence in sense implies similarity in grammatical nature." It proves too much, and therefore nothing. This mode of reasoning would confound the acknowledged grammatical distinction of words. A pronoun, on this principle, may be proved to be a noun; a noun, a verb; an adverb, a noun and preposition; the superlative degree, the comparative; the imperative mood, the indicative; the future tense, the present; and so on: because they may respectively be resolved into similar meanings. Thus, in the sentence, "I desire you to depart," the words *to depart*, may be called a noun, because they are equivalent in sense to the noun *departure*, in the following sentence, "I desire your departure." The words, "Depart instantly," may be proved to be, not the imperative mood with an adverb, but the indicative and infinitive, with a noun and preposition; for they are equivalent to, "I desire you to depart in an instant." The *superlative* degree in this sentence, "Of all acquirements virtue is the most valuable," may pass for the *comparative*, because it conveys the same sentiment as, "Virtue is more valuable than every other acquirement."

We shall not pursue this subject any further, as the reader must be satisfied, that only the word *desire*, in the equivalent sentence, implies affirmation; and that one phrase may, in sense, be equivalent to another, though its grammatical nature is essentially different.

To verbs belong

NUMBER, PERSON, MOOD, AND TENSE.

Section 2.

Of Number and Person.

Verbs have two numbers, the Singular and the Plural: as, "I run, we run," &c.

In each number there are three persons: as,

	Singular.	Plural.
First Person.	I love.	We love.
Second Person.	Thou lovest.	Ye *or* you love.
Third Person.	He loves.	They love.

Thus the verb, in some parts of it, varies its endings, to express, or agree with, different persons of the same number: as, "I *love*, thou *lovest*; he *loveth*, or *loves*:" and also to express different numbers of the same person: as, "thou *lovest*, ye *love*; he *loveth*, they *love*." In the plural number of the verb, there is no variation of ending to express the different persons; and the verb, in the three persons plural, is the same as it is in the first person singular. Yet this scanty provision of terminations is sufficient for all the purposes of discourse, and no ambiguity arises from it: the verb being always attended, either with the noun expressing the subject acting or acted upon, or with the pronoun representing it. For this reason, the plural termination in *en*, *they loven*, *they weren*, formerly in use, was laid aside as unnecessary, and has long been obsolete.

SECTION 3.

Of Moods and Participles.

MOOD or Mode is a particular form of the verb, showing the manner in which the being, action, or passion, is represented.

THE nature of a mood may be more intelligibly explained to the scholar, by observing, that it consists in the change which the verb undergoes, to signify various intentions of the mind, and various modifications and circumstances of action: which explanation, if compared with the following account and uses of the different moods, will be found to agree with and illustrate them.

There are five moods of verbs,

THE INDICATIVE,	THE SUBJUNCTIVE,
THE IMPERATIVE,	AND
THE POTENTIAL,	THE INFINITIVE.

The Indicative Mood simply indicates or declares a thing: as, "He loves, he is loved:" or it asks a question: as, "Does he love?" "Is he loved?"

The Imperative Mood is used for commanding, exhorting, entreating, or permitting: as, "Depart thou; mind ye; let us stay; go in peace."

THOUGH this mood derives its name from its intimation of command, it is used on occasions of a very opposite nature, even in the humblest supplications of an inferior

being, to one who is infinitely his superior: as, "Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses."

The Potential Mood implies possibility or liberty, power, will, or obligation: as, "It may rain; he may go or stay; I can ride; he would walk; they should learn."

The Subjunctive Mood represents a thing under a condition, motive, wish, supposition, &c.; and is preceded by a conjunction, expressed or understood, and attended by another verb: as, "I will respect him, *though* he chide me;" "Were he good, he would be happy;" that is, "*if* he were good."

The Infinitive Mood expresses a thing in a general and unlimited manner, without any distinction of number or person: as, "to act, to speak, to be feared."

The participle is a certain form of the verb, and derives its name from its participating, not only of the properties of a verb, but also of those of an adjective: as, "I am desirous of *knowing him;*" "*admired* and *applauded,* he became vain;" "*Having finished* his work, he submitted it," &c.

In the phrase, "An admired performance," the word *admired* has the form of the imperfect tense, and of the participle passive of the verb *to admire;* and, at the same time, it denotes a quality of the substantive *performance,* which shows it to be an adjective.

There are three participles, the Present or Active, the Perfect or Passive, and the Compound Perfect: as, "loving, loved, having loved.

AGREEABLY to the general practice of grammarians, we have represented the present participle, as active; and the past, as passive: but they are not uniformly so; the present is sometimes passive; and the past is frequently active. Thus, "The youth *was consuming* by a slow malady;" "The Indian *was burning* by the cruelty of his enemies;" "The number is *augmenting* daily;" "Plutarch's Lives are *reprinting*;" appear to be instances of the present participle being used passively. "He *has instructed* me;" "I *have* gratefully *repaid* his kindness;" are examples of the past participle being applied in an active sense. We may also observe, that the present participle is sometimes associated with the past and future tenses of the verb; and the past participle connected with the present and future tenses.—The most unexceptionable distinction which grammarians make between the participles, is, that the one points to the continuation of the action, passion, or state, denoted by the verb; and the other, to the completion of it. Thus, the present participle signifies *imperfect* action, or action begun and not ended: as, "I *am writing* a letter." The past participle signifies action *perfected*, or finished: as, "I have *written* a letter;" "The letter is *written**."

The participle is distinguished from the adjective, by the former's expressing the idea of time, and the latter's denoting only a quality. The phrases, "*loving* to give as well as to receive," "*moving* in haste," "*heated* with liquor," contain participles giving the idea of time; but

* When this participle is joined to the verb *to have*, it is called *perfect;* when it is joined to the verb *to be*, or understood with it, it is denominated *passive*.

the epithets contained in the expressions, "a *loving* child," a *moving* spectacle," "a *heated* imagination," mark simply the qualities referred to, without any regard to time; and may properly be called participial adjectives.

Participles not only convey the notion of time; but they also signify actions, and govern the cases of nouns and pronouns, in the same manner as verbs do; and therefore should be comprehended in the general name of verbs. That they are mere modes of the verb, is manifest, if our definition of a verb be admitted: for they signify being, doing, or suffering, with the designation of time superadded. But if the essence of the verb be made to consist in affirmation or assertion, not only the participle will be excluded from its place in the verb, but the infinitive itself also; which certain ancient grammarians, of great authority, held to be alone the genuine verb, simple and unconnected with persons and circumstances.

The following phrases, even when considered in themselves, show that participles include the idea of time: "The letter *being written*, or *having been written*;" "Charles *being writing*, *having written*, or *having been writing*." But when arranged in an entire sentence, which they must be to make a complete sense, they show it still more evidently: as, "Charles *having written* the letter, sealed and dispatched it."—The participle does indeed associate with different tenses of the verb: as, "I am writing," "I was writing," "I shall be writing:" but this forms no just objection to its denoting time. If the time of it is often relative time, this circumstance, far from disproving, supports our position*. *See observations under Rule* 13 *of Syntax.*

---

* From the very nature of time, an action may be *present now*, it may *have been present formerly*, or it may *be present* at some *future period*—yet who ever supposed, that the present of the indicative denotes no time?

Encyclopædia Britannica.

Participles sometimes perform the office of substantives, and are used as such: as in the following instances: "The *beginning*;" "a good *understanding*;" "excellent *writing*;" "The chancellor's *being attached* to the king secured his crown:" "The general's *having failed* in this enterprise occasioned his disgrace;" "John's *having been writing* a long time had wearied him."

That the words in italics of the three latter examples, perform the office of substantives, and may be considered as such, will be evident, if we reflect, that the first of them has exactly the same meaning and construction as, "The chancellor's attachment to the king secured his crown;" and that the other examples will bear a similar construction. The words, *being attached*, govern the word *chancellor's* in the possessive case, in the one instance, as clearly as *attachment* governs it in that case, in the other: and it is only substantives, or words and phrases which operate as substantives, that govern the genitive or possessive case.

The following sentence is not precisely the same as the above, either in sense or construction, though, except the genitive case, the words are the same: "The chancellor, being attached to the king, secured his crown." In the former, the words, *being attached*, form the nominative case to the verb, and are stated as the cause of the effect; in the latter, they are not the nominative case, and make only a circumstance to *chancellor*, which is the proper nominative. It may not be improper to add another form of this sentence, by which the learner may better understand the peculiar nature and form of each of these modes of expression: "The chancellor being attached to the king, his crown was secured." This constitutes what is properly called, the CASE ABSOLUTE; or, the NOMINATIVE ABSOLUTE.

SECTION 4.

Remarks on the Potential Mood.

THAT the Potential Mood should be separated from the subjunctive, is evident, from the intricacy and confusion which are produced by their being blended together, and from the distinct nature of the two moods; the former of which may be expressed without any condition, supposition, &c. as will appear from the following instances: "They *might* have done better," "We *may* always act uprightly;" "He was generous, and *would* not take revenge;" "We *should* resist the allurements of vice;" "I *could* formerly indulge myself in things, of which I *cannot* now think but with pain."

Some grammarians have supposed that the Potential Mood, as distinguished above from the Subjunctive, coincides with the Indicative. But as the latter "simply indicates or declares a thing," it is manifest that the former, which modifies the declaration, and introduces an idea materially distinct from it, must be considerably different. "I *can* walk," "I *should* walk," appear to be so essentially distinct from the simplicity of, "I walk," "I walked," as to warrant a correspondent distinction of moods. The Imperative and Infinitive Moods, which are allowed to retain their rank, do not appear to contain such strong marks of discrimination from the Indicative, as are found in the Potential Mood.

There are other writers on this subject, who exclude the Potential Mood from their division, because it is formed, not by varying the principal verb, but by means of the auxiliary verbs *may, can, might, could, would,* &c.: but if we recollect, that moods are used "to signify various intentions of the mind, and various modifications and cir-

cumstances of action," we shall perceive that those auxiliaries, far from interfering with this design, do, in the clearest manner, support and exemplify it. On the reason alleged by these writers, the greater part of the Indicative Mood must also be excluded; as but a small part of it is conjugated without auxiliaries. The Subjunctive too will fare no better; since it so nearly resembles the Indicative, and is formed by means of conjunctions, expressed or understood, which do not more effectually show the varied intentions of the mind, than the auxiliaries do which are used to form the Potential Mood.

Some writers have given our moods a much greater extent than we have assigned to them. They assert that the English language may be said, without any great impropriety, to have as many moods as it has auxiliary verbs; and they allege, in support of their opinion, that the compound expressions which they help to form, point out those various dispositions and actions, which, in other languages, are expressed by moods. This would be to multiply the moods without advantage. It is, however, certain, that the conjugation or variation of verbs, in the English language, is effected, almost entirely, by the means of auxiliaries. We must, therefore, accommodate ourselves to this circumstance; and do that by their assistance, which has been done in the learned languages, (a few instances to the contrary excepted,) in another manner, namely, by varying the form of the verb itself. At the same time, it is necessary to set proper bounds to this business, so as not to occasion obscurity and perplexity, when we mean to be simple and perspicuous. Instead, therefore, of making a separate mood for every auxiliary verb, and introducing moods *Interrogative*, *Optative*, *Promissive*, *Hortative*, *Precative*, &c. we have exhibited such only as are obviously distinct; and which, whilst they are calculated to unfold and display the subject intelligibly to the learner, seem

to be sufficient, and not more than sufficient, to answer all the purposes for which moods were introduced.

From Grammarians who form their ideas, and make their decisions, respecting this part of English Grammar, on the principles and construction of languages, which, in these points, do not suit the peculiar nature of our own, but differ considerably from it, we may naturally expect grammatical schemes, that are not very perspicuous, nor perfectly consistent, and which will tend more to perplex than inform the learner. See Sections 8 and 9, of this Chapter: and Note 8, under the 19th Rule of Syntax.

SECTION 5.

Of the Tenses.

TENSE, being the distinction of time, might seem to admit only of the present, past, and future; but to mark it more accurately, it is made to consist of six variations, viz.

THE PRESENT, THE PERFECT,
THE IMPERFECT, THE PLUPERFECT,
AND
THE FIRST AND SECOND FUTURE TENSES.

The present Tense represents an action or event, as passing at the time in which it is mentioned: as, "I rule; I am ruled; I think; I fear."

THE present tense likewise expresses a character, quality, &c. at present existing: as, "He is an able man;" "She is an amiable woman." It is also used in speaking of actions continued, with occasional intermissions, to the present time: as, "He frequently rides;" "He walks

out every morning;" "He goes into the country every summer." We sometimes apply this tense even to persons long since dead: as, "Seneca reasons and moralizes well;" "Job speaks feelingly of his afflictions."

The present tense, preceded by the words, *when*, *before*, *after*, *as soon as*, &c. is sometimes used to point out the relative time of a future action: as, "*When* he arrives he will hear the news;" "He will hear the news *before* he arrives, or *as soon as* he arrives, or, at farthest, *soon after* he arrives;" "The more she *improves*, the more amiable she will be."

In animated historical narrations, this tense is sometimes substituted for the imperfect tense: as, "He *enters* the territory of the peaceable inhabitants: he *fights* and *conquers*, *takes* an immense booty, which he *divides* amongst his soldiers, and *returns* home to enjoy a vain and useless triumph."

Every point of space or duration, how minute soever it may be, has some degree of extension. Neither the present, nor any other, instant of time, is wholly unextended. Nay, we cannot conceive, as Dr. Beattie justly observes, an unextended instant: and that which we call the *present*, may in fact admit of very considerable extension.—While I write a letter, or read a book, I say, that I *am* reading or writing it, though it should take up an hour, a day, a week, or a month; the whole time being considered as present, which is employed in the present action. So, while I build a house, though that should be the work of many months, I speak of it in the present time, and say that I *am building* it. In like manner, in contradistinction to the century past, and to that which is to come, we may consider the whole space of a hundred years as time present, when we speak of a series of actions, or of a state of existence, that is coextended with it; as in the following example: "In this century *we are* more neglectful of the ancients, and *we*

are consequently more ignorant, than they *were* in the last, or perhaps they *will be* in the next. Nay, the entire term of man's probationary state in this world, when opposed to that eternity which is before him, is considered as present time by those who say, "In this state *we see* darkly as through a glass; but in a future life, our faith *will be* lost in vision, and *we shall know* even as we are known."

The imperfect Tense represents the action or event, either as past and finished, or as remaining unfinished at a certain time past: as, "I loved her for her modesty and virtue;" "They were travelling post when he met them."

THE first example, in the preceding paragraph, shows that the action was past and finished, though the precise time of it, was not defined. In this point of view, the tense may be said to be *imperfect:* the time of the action is not exactly and perfectly ascertained.—In the second instance, the action is represented as past, but not finished; and it may therefore with propriety, be denominated *imperfect.*

It is proper to observe, on this occasion, that in such sentences as the following; "He wrote to him yesterday;" "They behaved themselves at that period very properly;" the precise time of the action is not denoted, by the tense of the verb itself; but by the addition of the words, *yesterday,* and *at that period.*—See the Note at page ; and the last paragraph of the Eighth chapter of Etymology, on the subject of Adverbs.

The Perfect Tense not only refers to what is past, but also conveys an allusion to the present time: as, "I have finished my letter;" "I have seen the person that was recommended to me."

In the former example, it is signified that the finishing of the letter, though past, was at a period immediately preceding the present time. In the latter instance, it is uncertain whether the person mentioned was seen by the speaker a long or short time before. The meaning is, "I have seen him sometime in the course of a period which includes, or comes to, the present time." In both instances, "The finishing of the letter," and "The seeing of the person," comprehend periods, each of which extends to the time present. We have no idea of any certain portion of time intervening, between the time of action and the time of speaking of it. The sentence, "I have written a letter," implies that "I have, or possess, the finished action of writing a letter." Under these views of the subject, it appears that the term *perfect* may be properly applied to this tense; as the action is not only finished, but the period of its completion is specially referred to, and ascertained.

When the particular time of any occurrence is specified, as prior to the present time, this tense is not used; for it would be improper to say, "I *have seen* him yesterday;" or, "I *have finished* my work last week." In these cases the imperfect is necessary: as, "I *saw* him yesterday;" "I *finished* my work last week." But when we speak indefinitely of any thing past, as happening or not happening in the day, year, or age, in which we mention it, the perfect must be employed: as, "I *have been* there this morning;" "I *have travelled* much this year:" "We *have escaped* many dangers through life." In referring, however, to such a division of the day as is past before the time of our speaking, we use the imperfect: as, "They *came* home early this morning;" "He *was* with them at three o'clock this afternoon."

The perfect tense, and the imperfect tense, both denote a thing that is past; but the former denotes it in such a manner, that there is still actually remaining some part of

the time to slide away, wherein we declare the thing has been done; whereas the imperfect denotes the thing or action past, in such a manner, that nothing remains of that time in which it was done. If we speak of the present century, we say, "Philosophers *have made* great discoveries in the present century:" but if we speak of the last century, we say, "Philosophers *made* great discoveries in the last century." "He *has been* much afflicted this year;" "I *have* this week *read* the king's proclamation;" "I *have heard* great news this morning:" in these instances, "He *has been*," "I *have read*," and "*heard*," denote things that are past; but they occurred in this year, in this week, and to-day; and still there remains a part of this year, week, and day, whereof I speak.

In general, the perfect tense may be applied wherever the action is connected with the present time, by the actual existence, either of the author, or of the work, though it may have been performed many centuries ago; but if neither the author nor the work now remains, it cannot be used. We may say, "Cicero *has written* orations;" but we cannot say, "Cicero *has written* poems;" because the orations are in being, but the poems are lost. Speaking of priests in general, we may say, "They *have* in all ages *claimed* great powers;" because the general order of the priesthood still exists: but if we speak of the Druids, as a particular order of priests, which does not now exist, we cannot use this tense. We cannot say, "The Druid priests *have claimed* great powers;" but must say, "The Druid priests *claimed* great powers;" because that order is now totally extinct*.

The perfect tense, preceded by the words *when*, *after*, *as soon as*, &c. is often used to denote the relative time of

---

* *See* PICKBOURN *on the English Verb:* to whose ingenious DISSERTATION the author is indebted, for several Observations and Examples, respecting the Tenses of our Verbs.

a future action: as, "*When* I have finished my letter, I will attend to his request:" "I will attend to the business, *as soon as* I have finished my letter."

The Pluperfect Tense represents a thing, not only as past, but also as prior to some other point of time specified in the sentence: as, "I had finished my letter before he arrived."

THE term used to designate this tense, may, in some degree at least, be justified, by observing that the time of the action or event, is *more than*, or *beyond*, the time of some other action or event to which it refers, and which is in the *perfect*, or the *imperfect* tense. Thus, in the sentences, "I *have seen* him, but I *had written* to him before;" "Though he *had not then agreed* to the proposal, he *has* at length *consented* to it;" "I *saw* him after I *had written* to him;" "He *decided* indeed very culpably, but he *had been* vehemently *urged* to it;" the pluperfect extends not only beyond, and precedent to, the time signified in the perfect tense, but also that denoted by the imperfect.

The first Future Tense represents the action as yet to come, either with or without respect to the precise time: as, "The sun will rise to-morrow;" "I shall see them again."

The Second Future intimates that the action will be fully accomplished, at or before the time of another future action or event: as, "I shall have dined at one o'clock;" "The two houses will have finished their business, when the king comes to prorogue them."

IT is to be observed, that in the subjunctive mood, the event being spoken of under a condition or supposition, or

in the form of a wish, and therefore as doubtful and contingent, the verb itself in the present, and the auxiliary both of the present and past imperfect times, often carry with them somewhat of a future sense: as, "If he come to-morrow, I may speak to him;" "If he should, or would come to-morrow, I might, would, could, or should speak to him." Observe also, that the auxiliaries *should* and *would*, in the imperfect times, are used to express the present and future as well as the past: as, "It is my desire, that he should, or would, come now, or to-morrow;" as well as, "It was my desire, that he should or would come yesterday." So that, in this mood, the precise time of the verb is very much determined by the nature and drift of the sentence.

In treating of the tenses, there are two things to which attention ought principally to be turned,—the *relation* which the several tenses have to one another, in respect of *time;* and the *notice* which they give of an action's being *completed* or *not completed.*

The present, past, and future tenses, may be used either *definitely* or *indefinitely*, both with respect to *time and action.* When they denote customs or habits, and not individual acts, they are applied indefinitely: as, "Virtue *promotes* happiness;" "the old Romans *governed* by benefits more than by fear;" "I *shall* hereafter *employ* my time more usefully." In these examples, the words, *promotes, governed*, and *shall employ*, are used indefinitely, both in regard to action and time; for they are not confined to individual actions, nor to any precise points of present, past, or future time. When they are applied to signify particular actions, and to ascertain the precise points of time to which they are confined, they are used definitely; as in the following instances. "My brother *is writing;*" "He *built* the house last summer, but did not *inhabit* it till yesterday." "He *will write* another letter to-morrow."

The different tenses also represent an action as *complete* or *perfect*, or as *incomplete* or *imperfect*. In the phrases, "I am writing," "I was writing," "I shall be writing," imperfect, unfinished actions are signified. But the following examples, "I wrote," "I have written," "I had written," "I shall have written," all denote complete, perfect action.

The distinction of the tenses into *definite* and *indefinite*, may be more intelligible to the student, by the following explanation and arrangement*.

PRESENT TENSE.

Indefinite. This form of the present tense denotes action or being, in present time, without limiting it with exactness to a given point. It expresses also facts which exist generally, at all times, general truths, attributes which are permanent, habits, customary actions, and the like, without the reference to a specific time: as, "Hope *springs* eternal in the human breast; Virtue *promotes* happiness; Man *is* imperfect and dependent; The wicked *flee* when no man pursueth; Plants *rise* from the earth; Sometimes he *works*, but he often *plays*; Birds *fly*; Fishes *swim*."

Definite. This form expresses the present time with precision; and it usually denotes action or being, which corresponds in time with another action: as, "He *is meditating*; I *am writing*, while you *are waiting*."

---

* Though the author thinks he has, in the Introduction to his Grammar, offered a sufficient apology, for the use he has made of his predecessors' labours, and for omitting to insert their names; yet it may not be improper, on the present occasion, to observe, that the following detailed view of the tenses into *definite* and *indefinite*, is, in part, taken from Webster's Grammar; and that a few positions and illustrations, amongst some of the Syntactical Notes and Observations, have also been selected from this grammarian, for the *Octavo edition* of the Grammar.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Indefinite. This form of the imperfect tense represents action past and finished, and often with the precise time undefined: as, "Alexander *conquered* the Persians; Scipio *was* as virtuous as brave."

Definite. This form represents an action as taking place and unfinished, in some specified period of past time: as, "I *was standing* at the door, when the procession passed."

PERFECT TENSE.

Indefinite. This form of the perfect tense represents an action completely past, and often at no great distance, but not specified: as, "I have accomplished my design;" "I have read the History of England."

Definite. This form represents an action as just finished: as, "I have been reading a History of the Revolution;" "I have been studying hard to-day."

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

Indefinite. This form of the pluperfect tense, expresses an action which was past at or before some other past time specified: as, "He *had received* the news before the messenger arrived."

Definite. This form denotes an action to be just past, at or before another past time specified: as, "I had been waiting an hour, when the messenger arrived."

FIRST FUTURE TENSE.

Indefinite. This form of the first future, simply gives notice of an event to happen hereafter: as, "Charles *will go* to London;" "I think we *shall have* a fine season."

Definite. This form expresses an action, which is to take place, and be unfinished, at a specified future time: as, "He *will be preparing* for a visit, at the time you arrive."

SECOND FUTURE TENSE.

Indefinite. This form of the second future, denotes an action which will be past at a future time specified: as, "They *will have accomplished* their purpose, at the time they proposed."

Definite. This form represents an action, which will be just past at a future specified time: as, "The scholars *will have been studying* an hour, when the tutor comes to examine them."

The student will observe, that, in this scheme, all the *definite* tenses are formed by the participle of the present tense, and the substantive verb *to be.*

There are other modes of expressing future time: as, "I am going to write;" "I am about to write." These have been called the *Inceptive* future, as they note the commencement of an action, or an intention to commence an action without delay.

The substantive verb followed by a verb in the infinitive mood, forms another method of indicating future time: as, "Ferdinand *is to command* the army." "On the subject of style, I *am* afterwards *to discourse.*" Eneas went in search of the seat of an empire, which *was*, one day, *to govern* the world." The latter expression has been called a future past: that is, *past* as to the narrator; but *future* as to the event, at the time specified.

From the preceding representation of the different tenses, it appears, that each of them has its distinct and peculiar province; and that though some of them may sometimes be used promiscuouly, or substituted one for another, in cases where great accuracy is not required, yet there is a real and essential difference in their meaning.—It is also evident, that the English language contains the six tenses which we have enumerated. Grammarians who limit the number to two, or at most to three, namely, the present,

the imperfect, and the future, do not reflect that the English verb is mostly composed of principal and auxiliary; and that these several parts constitute one verb. Either the English language has no regular future tense, or its future is composed of the auxiliary and the principal verb. If the latter be admitted, then the auxiliary and principal united, constitute a tense, in one instance; and, from reason and analogy, may doubtless do so, in others, in which minuter divisions of time are necessary, or useful. What reason can be assigned for not considering this case, as other cases, in which a whole is regarded as composed of several parts, or of principal and adjuncts? There is nothing heterogeneous in the parts: and precedent, analogy, utility, and even necessity, authorize the union.

In support of this opinion, we have the authority of eminent grammarians; in particular, that of Dr. Beattie. "Some writers," says the doctor, "will not allow any thing to be a tense, but what, in one inflected word, expresses an affirmation with time; for that those parts of the verb are not properly called tenses, which assume that appearance, by means of auxiliary words. At this rate, we should have, in English, two tenses only, the present and the past in the active verb, and in the passive no tenses at all. But this is a needless nicety; and, if adopted, would introduce confusion into the grammatical art. If *amaveram* be a tense, why should not *amatus fueram?* If *I heard* be a tense, *I did hear, I have heard,* and *I shall hear,* must be equally entitled to that appellation."

The proper form of a tense, in the Greek and Latin tongues, is certainly that which it has in the grammars of those languages. But in the Greek and Latin grammars, we uniformly find, that some of the tenses are formed by variations of the principal verb; and others, by the addition of a helping verb. It is, therefore, indisputable, that the principal verb or rather its participle, and an auxiliary, constitute a regular tense in the Greek and

Latin languages. This point being established, we may, doubtless, apply it to English verbs; and extend the principle as far as convenience, and the idiom of our language require.

If it should be said, that, on the same ground that a participle and auxiliary are allowed to form a tense, and the verb is to be conjugated accordingly, the English noun and pronoun ought to be declined at large, with articles and prepositions; we must object to the inference. Such a mode of declension is not adapted to our language. This we thing has been already proved*. It is also confessedly inapplicable to the learned languages. Where then is the grammatical inconsistency, or the want of conformity to the principles of analogy, in making some tenses of the English verb to consist of principal and auxiliary; and the cases of English nouns, chiefly in their termination? The argument from analogy, instead of militating against us, appears to confirm and establish our position. See pages 117—119. Sections 8 and 9 of this chapter, and the 19th Rule of Syntax. Note 8.

We shall close these remarks on the tenses, with a few observations extracted from the ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA. They are worth the student's attention, as a part of them applies, not only to our views of the tenses, but to many other parts of the work.—"Harris [by way of hypothesis] has enumerated no fewer than twelve tenses. Of this enumeration we can by no means approve: for, without entering into a minute examination of it, nothing can be more obvious, than that his *inceptive present*, "I am going to write," is a future tense; and his *completive present*, "I have written," a past tense. But, as was before observed of the classification of words, we cannot help being of opinion, that, to take the tenses as they are commonly received, and endeavour to ascertain

* See pages 85, 86.

their nature and their differences, is a much more useful exercise, as well as more proper for a work of this kind, than to raise, as might easily be raised, new theories on the subject *."

SECTION 6.

The Conjugation of the auxiliary verbs TO HAVE *and* TO BE.

THE Conjugation of a verb, is the regular combination and arrangement of its several numbers, persons, moods, and tenses.

The Conjugation of an active verb is styled the ACTIVE VOICE; and that of a passive verb, the PASSIVE VOICE.

The auxiliary and active verb TO HAVE, is conjugated in the following manner:

TO HAVE.

Indicative Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. *Pers.* I have.	1. We have.
2. *Pers.* Thou hast.	2. Ye *or* you have.
3. *Pers.* He, she, *or* it hath or has. †	3. They have.

* The following criticism affords an additional support to the author's system of the tenses, &c.

"Under the head of Etymology, the author of this grammar judiciously adheres to the natural simplicity of the English language, without embarrassing the learner with distinctions peculiar to the Latin tongue. The difficult subject of the Tenses, is clearly explained; and with less encumbrance of technical phraseology, than in most other grammars." *Analytical Review.*

† *Hath* is now used only in poetry, and on very serious occasions. *Ye* is nearly obsolete.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I had.	1. We had,
2. Thou hadst.	2. Ye *or* you had.
3. He, &c. had.	3. They had.

PERFECT TENSE*.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I have had.	1. We have had.
2. Thou hast had.	2. Ye *or* you have had.
3. He has had.	3. They have had.

PLUPERFECT TENSE*.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I had had.	1. We had had.
2. Thou hadst had.	2. Ye *or* you had had.
3. He had had.	3. They had had.

FIRST FUTURE TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I shall *or* will have.	1. We shall *or* will have.
2. Thou shalt *or* wilt have,	2. Ye *or* you shall or will have.
3. He shall *or* will have.	3. They shall *or* will have.

SECOND FUTURE TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I shall have had.	1. We shall have had.
2. Thou wilt have had.	2. Ye *or* you will have had.
3. He will have had.	3. They will have had.

---

* The terms which we have adopted, to designate the three past tenses, may not be exactly significant of their nature and distinctions. But as they are used by grammarians in general, and have an established authority; and, especially, as the meaning attached to each of them, and their different significations, have been carefully explained; we presume that no solid objection can be made to the use of terms, so generally approved, and so explicitly defined. See pages 65, 66.

Imperative Mood.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. Let me have.	1. Let us have.
2. Have, *or* have thou, *or* do thou have.	2. Have, *or* have ye, *or* do ye *or* you have.
3. Let him have.	3. Let them have*.

The imperative mood is not strictly entitled to *three* persons. The command is always addressed to the *second* person, not to the first or third. For when we say, "Let me have," "Let him, or let them have," the meaning and construction are, *do thou*, or *do ye*, let me, him, or them have. In philosophical strictness, both number and person might be entirely excluded from every verb. They are, in fact, the properties of substantives, not a part of the essence of a verb. Even the name of the *imperative* mood, does not always correspond to its nature: for it sometimes *petitions* as well as commands. But, with respect to all these points, the practice of our grammarians is so uniformly fixed, and so analogous to the languages, ancient and modern, which our youth have to study, that it would be an unwarrantable degree of innovation, to deviate from the established terms and arrangements. See the *advertisement* at the end of the Introduction, page 16; and also pages 65, 66.

Potential Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I may *or* can have.	1. We may *or* can have.
2. Thou mayst *or* canst have.	2. Ye *or* you may *or* can have.
3. He may *or* can have.	3. They may *or* can have.

---

* If such sentences should be rigorously examined, the Imperative will appear to consist merely in the word *let*. See Directions for *Parsing*.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I might, could, would, *or* should have.	1. We might, could, would, *or* should have.
2. Thou mightst, couldst, wouldst, *or* shouldst have.	2. Ye *or* you might, could, would, *or* should have.
3. He might, could, would, *or* should have.	3. They might, could, would, *or* should have.

PERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I may *or* can have had.	1. We may *or* can have had.
2. Thou mayst *or* canst have had.	2. Ye *or* you may *or* can have had.
3. He may *or* can have had.	3. They may *or* can have had.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I might, could, would, *or* should have had.	1. We might, could, would, *or* should have had.
2. Thou mightst, couldst, wouldst, *or* shouldst have had.	2. Ye *or* you might, could, would, *or* should have had.
3. He might, could, would, *or* should have had.	3. They might, could, would, *or* should have had*.

---

* *Shall* and *will*, when they denote inclination, resolution, promise, may be considered as well as their relations *should* and *would*, as belonging to the potential mood. But as they generally signify futurity, they have been appropriated, as helping verbs, to the formation of the future tenses of the indicative and subjunctive moods.

Subjunctive Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. If I have.	1. If we have.
2. If thou have*.	2. If ye *or* you have.
3. If he have*.	3. If they have.

The remaining tenses of the subjunctive mood, are, in every respect, similar to the correspondent tenses of the indicative mood†; with the addition to the verb, of a conjunction, expressed or implied, denoting a condition, motive, wish, supposition, &c. It will be proper to direct the learner to repeat all the tenses of this mood, with a conjunction prefixed to each of them. See, on this subject, the observations in Section 8 of this chapter, and the notes on the nineteenth rule of Syntax.

* Grammarians, in general, conjugate the present of the auxiliary, in this manner. But we presume that this is the form of the verb, considered as a *principal*, not as an *auxiliary* verb. See Rule 19. Note 5.

† We must except the second and third persons, singular and plural, of the second future tense. These require the auxiliary *shalt, shall*, instead of *wilt, will*. Thus, "He *will* have completed the work by midsummer," is the indicative form: but the subjunctive is, "If he *shall* have completed the work by midsummer."

Infinitive Mood.

PRESENT. To have. PERFECT. To have had.

PARTICIPLES.

PRESENT OR ACTIVE.	Having.
PERFECT.	Had.
COMPOUND PERFECT.	Having had.

As the subjunctive mood, in English, has no variation, in the form of the verb, from the indicative, (except in the present tense, and the second future tense, of verbs generally, and the present and imperfect tenses of the verb *to be,)* it would be superfluous to conjugate it in this work, through every tense. But all the other moods and tenses of the verbs, both in the active and passive voices, are conjugated at large, that the learners may have no doubts or misapprehensions respecting their particular forms. They to whom the subject of grammar is entirely new, and young persons especially, are much more readily and effectually instructed, by seeing the parts of a subject so essential as the verb, unfolded and spread before them, in all their varieties, than by being generally and cursorily informed of the manner in which they may be exhibited. The time employed by the scholars, in consequence of this display of the verbs, is of small moment, compared with the advantages which they will probably derive from the plan.

It may not, however, be generally proper for young persons beginning the study of grammar, to commit to memory all the tenses of the verbs. If the *simple* tenses, namely, the *present* and the *imperfect*, together with the *first future tense*, should, in the first instance, be committed to memory, and the rest carefully perused and explained, the business will not be tedious to the scholars, and their progress will be rendered mose obvious and pleasing.

The general view of the subject, thus acquired and impressed, may afterwards be extended with ease and advantage.

It appears to be proper, for the information of the learners, to make a few observations in this place, on some of the tenses, &c. The first is, that, in the potential mood, some grammarians confound the present with the imperfect tense; and the perfect with the pluperfect. But that they are really distinct, and have an appropriate reference to time, correspondent to the definitions of those tenses, will appear from a few examples: "I wished him to stay, but he *would* not;" "I *could* not accomplish the business in time;" "It was my direction that he *should* submit;" "He was ill, but I thought he *might* live:" "I *may have misunderstood* him;" "He *cannot have deceived* me:" "He *might have finished* the work sooner, but he *could not have done* it better."—It must however, be admitted, that, on some occasions, the auxiliaries might, could, would, and should, refer also to present and to future time. See pages 124, 125.

The next remark is, that the auxiliary *will*, in the first person singular and plural of the second future tense; and the auxiliary *shall*, in the second and third persons of that tense, in the indicative mood, appear to be incorrectly applied. The impropriety of such associations may be inferred from a few examples: "I *will* have had previous notice, whenever the event happens;" "Thou *shalt* have served thy apprenticeship before the end of the year;" "He *shall* have completed his business when the messenger arrives." "I *shall* have had; thou *wilt* have served; he *will* have completed," &c. would have been correct and applicable. The peculiar import of these auxiliaries, as explained in Section 7 of this chapter, seems to account for their impropriety in the applications just mentioned.

Some writers on Grammar object to the propriety of admitting the second future, in both the indicative and

subjunctive moods: but that this tense is applicable to both moods, will be manifest from the following examples. "John will have earned his wages the next new-year's day," is a simple declaration, and therefore in the indicative mood: "If he shall have finished his work when the bell rings, he will be entitled to the reward," is conditional and contingent, and is therefore in the subjunctive mood.

We shall conclude these detached observations, with one remark which may be useful to the young scholar, namely, that as the indicative mood is converted into the subjunctive, by the expression of a condition, motive, wish, supposition, &c. being superadded to it; so the potential mood may, in like manner, be turned into the subjunctive; as will be seen in the following examples: "If I could deceive him, I should abhor it;" "Though he should increase in wealth, he would not be charitable;" "Even in prosperity he would gain no esteem, unless he should conduct himself better."

The auxiliary and neuter verb *To be*, is conjugated as follows:

To Be.

Indicative Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I am.	1. We are.
2. Thou art.	2. Ye *or* you are.
3. He, she, *or* it is.	3. They are.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I was.	1. We were.
2. Thou wast.	2. Ye *or* you were.
3. He was.	3. They were.

PERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I have been.	1. We have been.
2. Thou hast been.	2. Ye *or* you have been.
3. He hath *or* has been.	3. They have been.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I had been.	1. We had been.
2. Thou hadst been.	2. Ye *or* you had been.
3. He had been.	3. They had been.

FIRST FUTURE TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I shall *or* will be.	1. We shall *or* will be.
2. Thou shalt *or* wilt be.	2. Ye *or* you shall *or* will be.
3. He shall *or* will be.	3. They shall *or* will be.

SECOND FUTURE TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I shall have been.	1. We shall have been.
2. Thou wilt have been.	2. Ye *or* you will have been.
3. He will have been.	3. They will have been.

Imperative Mood.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. Let me be.	1. Let us be.
2. Be thou *or* do thou be.	2. Be ye *or* you, *or* do ye be.
3. Let him be.	3. Let them be.

Potential Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I may *or* can be.	1. We may *or* can be.
2. Thou mayst *or* canst be.	2. Ye *or* you may *or* can be.
3. He may *or* can be.	3. They may *or* can be.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I might, could, would, *or* should be.	1. We might, could, would, *or* should be.
2. Thou mightst, couldst, wouldst, *or* shouldst be.	2. Ye *or* you might, could, would, *or* should be.
3. He might, could, would, *or* should be.	3. They might, could, would, *or* should be.

PERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I may *or* can have been.	1. We may *or* can have been.
2. Thou mayst *or* canst have been.	2. Ye *or* you may *or* can have been.
3. He may *or* can have been.	3. They may *or* can have been.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I might, could, would, *or* should have been.	1. We might, could, would, *or* should have been.
2. Thou mightst, couldst, wouldst, *or* shouldst have been.	2. Ye *or* you might, could, would, *or* should have been.
3. He might, could, would, *or* should have been.	3. They might, could, would, *or* should have been.

THE TANJORE MAHARAJA SERFOJI

Subjunctive Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. If I be.	1. If we be.
2. If thou be.	2. If ye *or* you be.
3. If he be.	3. If they be.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. If I were.	1. If we were.
2. If thou wert.	2. If ye *or* you were.
3. If he were.	3. If they were.

The remaining tenses of this mood are, in general, similar to the correspondent tenses of the Indicative mood. See pages 136, 151, 152, and the notes under the nineteenth rule of Syntax.

Infinitive Mood.

PRESENT TENSE. To be. PERFECT. To have been.

Participles.

PRESENT. Being. PERFECT. Been.
COMPOUND PERFECT. Having been.

SECTION 7.

The Auxiliary Verbs conjugated in their simple form; with observations on their peculiar nature and force.

THE learner will perceive that the preceding auxiliary verbs, *to have* and *to be*, could not be conjugated through all the moods and tenses, without the help of other auxiliary verbs; namely, *may*, *can*, *will*, *shall*, and their variations.

That auxiliary verbs, in their simple state, and unassisted by others, are of a very limited extent; and that they are chiefly useful, in the aid which they afford in conjugating the principal verbs; will clearly appear to the scholar, by a distinct conjugation of each of them, uncombined with any other. They are exhibited for his inspection; not to be committed to memory.

To Have.

PRESENT TENSE.

Sing.	1. I have.	2. Thou hast.	3. He hath *or* has.
Plur.	1. We have.	2. Ye *or* you have.	3. They have.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Sing.	1. I had.	2. Thou hadst.	3. He had.
Plur.	1. We had.	2. Ye *or* you had.	3. They had.

PERFECT. I have had, &c. PLUPERFECT. I had had, &c.

PARTICIPLES.

PRESENT. Having PERFECT. Had.

To Be.

PRESENT TENSE.

Sing.	1. I am.	2. Thou art.	3. He is.
Plur.	1. We are.	2. Ye *or* you are.	3. They are.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Sing.	1. I was.	2. Thou wast.	3. He was.
Plur.	1. We were.	2. Ye *or* you were.	3. They were.

PARTICIPLES.

PRESENT. Being. PERFECT. Been.

Shall.

PRESENT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I shall*.	2. Thou shalt.	3. He shall.
Plur. 1. We shall.	2. Ye *or* you shall.	3. They shall.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I should.	2. Thou shouldst.	3. He should.
Plur. 1. We should.	2. Ye *or* you should.	3. They should.

Will.

PRESENT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I will.	2. Thou wilt.	3. He will.
Plur. 1. We will.	2. Ye *or* you will.	3. They will.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I would.	2. Thou wouldst.	3. He would
Plur. 1. We would	2. Ye *or* you would.	3. They would.

May.

PRESENT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I may.	2. Thou mayst.	3. He may.
Plur. 1. We may.	2. Ye *or* you may.	3. They may.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I might.	2. Thou mightst.	3. He might.
Plur. 1. We might.	2. Ye *or* you might.	3. They might.

---

* *Shall* is here properly used in the present tense, having the same analogy to *should* that *can* has to *could*, *may* to *might*, and *will* to *would*.

Can.

PRESENT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I can.	2. Thou canst.	3. He can.
Plur. 1. We can.	2. Ye *or* you can.	3. They can.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I could.	2. Thou couldst.	3. He could.
Plur. 1. We could.	2. Ye *or* you could.	3. They could.

To Do.

PRESENT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I do.	2. Thou dost.	3. He doth *or* does.
Plur. 1. We do.	2. Ye *or* you do.	3. They do.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Sing. 1. I did.	2. Thou didst.	3. He did.
Plur. 1. We did.	2. Ye *or* you did.	3. They did.

PARTICIPLES.

PRESENT. Doing. PERFECT. Done.

The verbs *have*, *be*, *will* and *do*, when they are unconnected with a principal verb, expressed or understood, are not auxiliaries, but principal verbs: as, "We *have* enough;" "I *am* grateful;" "He *wills* it to be so;" "They *do* as they please." In this view, they also have their auxiliaries: as, "I *shall have* enough;" "I *will be* grateful," &c.

The peculiar force of the several auxiliaries will appear from the following account of them.

Do and *did* mark the action itself, or the time of it, with greater energy and positiveness: as, "I *do* speak truth;"

"I *did* respect him;" "Here am I, for thou *didst* call me." They are of great use in negative sentences: as, "I *do not* fear;" "I *did not* write." They are almost universally employed in asking questions: as, "*Does* he learn?" "*Did* he not write?" They sometimes also supply the place of another verb, and make the repetition of it, in the same or a subsequent sentence, unnecessary: as, "You attend not to your studies as he *does;*" (i. e. as he attends, &c.) "I shall come if I can; but if I *do not*, please to excuse me;" (i. e. if I come not.)

Let, not only expresses permission, but entreating, exhorting, commanding: as, "Let us know the truth;" "Let me die the death of the righteous;" "Let not your hearts be too much elated with success;" "Let your inclinations submit to your duty."

May and *might* express the possibility or liberty of doing a thing; *can* and *could*, the power: as, "It may rain;" "I may write or read;" "He might have improved more than he has;" "He can write much better than he could last year."

Must is sometimes called in for a helper, and denotes necessity: as, "We must speak the truth, whenever we do speak, and we must not prevaricate."

Will, in the first person singular and plural, intimates resolution and promising; in the second and third person, only foretels: as, "I will reward the good, and will punish the wicked;" "We will remember benefits, and be grateful;" "Thou wilt, or he will, repent of that folly;" "You or they will have a pleasant walk."

Shall, on the contrary, in the first person, simply foretels; in the second and third persons, promises, commands, or threatens: as, "I shall go abroad;" "We shall dine at home;" "Thou shalt, or you shall, inherit the land;" Ye shall do justice and love mercy;" "They shall account for their misconduct." The following passage is not translated according to the distinct and

proper meaning of the words *shall* and *will:* "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever." It ought to be, "*Will* follow me," and "I *shall* dwell."—The foreigner who, as it is said, fell into the Thames, and cried out; "I *will* be drowned, no body *shall* help me;" made a sad misapplication of these auxiliaries.

These observations respecting the import of the verbs *will* and *shall*, must be understood of explicative sentences; for when the sentence is interrogative, just the reverse, for the most part, takes place: thus, "I *shall* go; you *will* go;" express event only: but, "*will* you go?" imports intention; and, "*shall* I go?" refers to the will of another. But, "He *shall* go," and "*shall* he go?" both imply will; expressing or referring to a command.

When the verb is put in the subjunctive mood, the meaning of these auxiliaries likewise undergoes some alteration; as the learner will readily perceive by a few examples: "He *shall* proceed," "If he *shall* proceed;" "You *shall* consent," "If you *shall* consent." These auxiliaries are sometimes interchanged, in the indicative and subjunctive moods, to convey the same meaning of the auxiliary: as, "He *will* not return," "If he *shall* not return;" "He *shall* not return," "If he *will* not return."

Would, primarily denotes inclination of will; and *should*, obligation: but they both vary their import, and are often used to express simple event.

Were is frequently used for *would be*, and *had*, for *would have:* as, "It *were* injustice to deny the execution of the law to any individual;" that is, "it *would be* injustice." "Many acts which *had* been blamable in a peaceable government, were employed to detect conspiracies;" that is, "which *would have* been blamable."

Sometimes that form of the auxiliary verbs *shall, will*, &c. which is generally conditional, is elegantly used to

express a very slight assertion, with a modest diffidence. Thus we say, "I *should* think it would be proper to give up the point;" that is, "I am rather inclined to think."

Some writers still use *shall* and *will*, *should* and *would*, as they were formerly used; that is, in a sense quite contrary to that in which they are generally used at present. The following expressions are instances of this incorrect practice: "We *would* have been wanting to ourselves, if we had complied with the demand;" "We *should*:" "We *will* therefore briefly unfold our reasons;" "We *shall*:" "He imagined, that, by playing one party against the other, he *would* easily obtain the victory over both;" "He *should* easily," &c.

In several familiar forms of expression, the word *shall* still retains its original signification, and does not mean, to promise, threaten, or engage, in the third person, but the mere futurition of an event: as, "This is as extraordinary a thing as one *shall* ever hear of."

Section 8.

The Conjugation of regular Verbs.

ACTIVE.

Verbs Active are called Regular, when they form their imperfect tense of the indicative mood, and their perfect participle, by adding to the verb, *ed*, or *d* only when the verb ends in *e*: as,

Present.	Imperfect.	Perf. Particip.
I favour.	I favoured.	Favoured.
I love.	I loved.	Loved.

A Regular Active Verb is conjugated in the following manner:

To Love.

—

Indicative Mood

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I love*.	1. We love.
2. Thou lovest.	2. Ye *or* you love.
3. He, she, *or* it, loveth † *or* loves.	3. They love.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I loved.	1. We loved.
2. Thou lovedst.	2. Ye *or* you loved.
3. He loved.	3. They loved.

PERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I have loved.	1. We have loved.
2. Thou hast loved.	2. Ye *or* you have loved.
3. He hath *or* has loved.	3. They have loved.

---

* In the present and imperfect tenses, we use a different form of the verb, when we mean to express energy and positiveness: as, "I *do* love; thou *dost* love; he *does* love; I *did* love; thou *didst* love; he *did* love."

† Dr. Coote justly observes, that this termination of the third person singular in *eth*, is now very rarely used, *es* or *s* being substituted for it. This practice is disapproved by Addison, as "multiplying a letter which was before too frequent in the English tongue; and adding to that hissing in our language, which is taken so much notice of by foreigners."—Notwithstanding this reproach, it has been aptly observed, that no passage, in English prose or verse, exhibits, within an equal space, such a repetition of the sibilant letter, as the following quotation from Horace:

Res Italas armis tuteris, moribus ornes,
Legibus emendes.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I had loved.	1. We had loved.
2. Thou hadst loved.	2. Ye *or* you had loved.
3. He had loved.	3. They had loved.

FIRST FUTURE TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I shall *or* will love.	1. We shall *or* will love.
2. Thou shalt *or* wilt love.	2. Ye *or* you shall *or* will love.
3. He shall *or* will love.	3. They shall *or* will love.

SECOND FUTURE TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I shall have loved.	1. We shall have loved.
2. Thou wilt have loved.	2. Ye *or* you will have loved.
3. He will have loved.	3. They will have loved.

Those tenses are called simple tenses, which are formed of the principal, without an auxiliary verb: as, "I love, I loved." The compound tenses are such as cannot be formed without an auxiliary verb: as, "I *have* loved; I *had* loved; I *shall* or *will* love; I *may* love; I *may be* loved; I *may have been* loved;" &c. These compounds are, however, to be considered as only different forms of the same verb.

Imperative Mood.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. Let me love.	1. Let us love.
2. Love, *or* love thou, *or* do thou love.	2. Love, *or* love ye *or* you, *or* do ye love.
3. Let him love.	3. Let them love.

Potential Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I may *or* can love.	1. We may *or* can love.
2. Thou mayst *or* canst love.	2. Ye *or* you may *or* can love.
3. He may *or* can love.	3. They may *or* can love.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I might, could, would, *or* should love.	1. We might, could, would, *or* should love.
2. Thou mightst, couldst, wouldst, *or* shouldst love.	2. Ye *or* you might, could, would, *or* should love.
3. He might, could, would, *or* should love.	3. They might, could, would, *or* should love.

PERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I may *or* can have loved.	1. We may *or* can have loved.
2. Thou mayst *or* canst have loved.	2. Ye *or* you may *or* can have loved.
3. He may *or* can have loved.	3. They may *or* can have loved.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I might, could, would, *or* should have loved.	1. We might, could, would, *or* should have loved.
2. Thou mightst, couldst, wouldst, *or* shouldst have loved.	2. Ye *or* you might, could, would, *or* should have loved.
3. He might, could, would, *or* should have loved.	3. They might, could, would *or* should have loved.

Subjunctive Mood.

PRESENT TENSE*.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. If I love.	1. If we love.
2. If thou love.	2. If ye *or* you love.
3. If he love.	3. If they love.

The remaining tenses of this mood, are, in general, similar to the correspondent tenses of the Indicative mood. See pages 130, 152, 153.

It may be of use to the scholar, to remark in this place, that though only the conjunction *if* is affixed to the verb, any other conjunction proper for the subjunctive mood, may, with equal propriety, be occasionally annexed. The instance given is sufficient to explain the subject: more would be tedious, and tend to embarrass the learner.

Infinitive Mood.

PRESENT. To love. PERFECT. To have loved.

PARTICIPLES.

PRESENT. Loving. PERFECT. Loved.

COMPOUND PERFECT. Having loved.

The active verb may be conjugated differently, by adding its present or active participle to the auxiliary verb *to be*, through all its moods and tenses: as, instead of "I teach, thou teachest, he teaches," &c.; we may say, "I am teaching, thou art teaching, he is teaching," &c.: and instead of "I taught," &c. "I was teaching," &c.:

* On the propriety of denominating this the present tense of the subjunctive mood, see the Note near the end of the 19th Rule.

and so on, through all the variations of the auxiliary. This mode of conjugation has, on particular occasions, a peculiar propriety; and contributes to the harmony and precision of the language. These forms of expression are adapted to particular acts, not to general habits, or affections of the mind. They are very frequently applied to neuter verbs: as, "I am musing; he is sleeping*."

Some grammarians apply, what is called the *conjunctive termination*, to the persons of the principal verb, and to its auxiliaries, through all the tenses of the subjunctive mood. But this is certainly contrary to the practice of good writers. Johnson applies this termination to the present and perfect tenses only. Lowth restricts it entirely to the present tense; and Priestley confines it to the present and imperfect tenses. This difference of opinion amongst grammarians of such eminence, may have contributed to that diversity of practice, so observable in the use of the subjunctive mood. Uniformity in this point is highly desiderable. It would materially assist both teachers and learners; and would constitute a considerable improvement in our language. On this subject, we adopt the opinion of Dr. Lowth; and conceive we are fully warranted by his authority, and that of the most correct and elegant writers, in limiting the conjunctive termination of the principal verb, to the second and third persons singular of the *present tense.*

Grammarians have not only differed in opinion, respecting the extent and variations of the subjunctive mood; but a few of them have even doubted the existence of such a

* As the participle, in this mode of conjugation, performs the office of a verb through all the moods and tenses; and as it implies the idea of time, and governs the objective case of nouns and pronouns, in the same manner as verbs do; is it not manifest, that it is a species or form of the verb, and that it cannot be properly considered as a distinct part of speech?

mood in the English language. These writers assert that the verb has no variation from the indicative; and that a conjunction added to the verb, gives it no title to become a distinct mood; or, at most, no better than it would have if any other particle were joined to it. To these observations it may be replied; 1st. It is evident, on inspection, that, in the subjunctive mood, the present tense of the principal verbs, the present and imperfect tenses of the verb *to be*, and the second and third persons, in both numbers, of the second future tense of all verbs*; require a variation from the forms which those tenses have in the indicative mood. So much difference in the form of the verb, would warrant a correspondent distinction of mood, though the remaining parts of the subjunctive were, in all respects, similar to those of the indicative. In other languages, a principle of this nature has been admitted, both in the conjugation of verbs, and the declension of nouns. 2d. There appears to be as much propriety, in giving a conjunction the power of assisting to form the subjunctive mood, as there is in allowing the particle *to* to have an effect in the formation of the infinitive mood†. 3d. A conjunction added to the verb, shows the manner of being, doing, or suffering, which other particles cannot show: they do not coalesce with the verb, and modify it, as conjunctions do. 4th. It may be said, "If contingency constitutes the subjunctive mood, then it is the sense of a phrase, and not a conjunction, that determines this mood." But a little reflection will show, that the contingent sense

* We think it has been proved, that the auxiliary is a constituent part of the verb to which it relates: that the principal and its auxiliary form but one verb.

† Conjunctions have an influence on the mood of the following verb. *Dr. Beattie.*

Conjunctions have sometimes a government of moods. *Dr. Lowth.*

lies in the meaning and force of the conjunction, expressed or understood.

This subject may be farther illustrated, by the following observations.—Moods have a foundation in nature. They show what is certain; what is possible; what is conditional; what is commanded. They express also other conceptions and volitions; all signifying the manner of being, doing, or suffering. But as it would tend to obscure, rather than elucidate the subject, if the moods were particularly enumerated, grammarians have very properly given them such combinations and arrangements, as serve to explain the nature of this part of language, and to render the knowledge of it easily attainable.

The grammars of some languages contain a greater number of the moods, than others, and exhibit them in different forms. The Greek and Roman tongues denote them, by particular variations in the verb itself. This form, however, was the effect of ingenuity and improvement: it is not essential to the nature of the subject. The moods may be as effectually designated by a plurality of words, as by a change in the appearance of a single word; because the same ideas are denoted, and the same ends accomplished, by either manner of expression.

On this ground, the moods of the English verb, as well as the tenses, are, with great propriety, formed partly by the principal verb itself, and partly by the assistance which that verb derives from other words. For further observations, relative to the views and sentiments here advanced, see pages 117—119. 128—131. Section 9 of this chapter, and Note 8 of the 19th Rule of Syntax.

PASSIVE.

VERBS Passive are called regular, when they form their perfect participle by the addition of *d* or *ed*, to the verb: as, from the verb "To love,"

is formed the passive, "I am loved, I was loved, I shall be loved," &c.

A passive verb is conjugated by adding the perfect participle to the auxiliary *to be*, through all its changes of number, person, mood, and tense, in the following manner.

To be Loved.

—

Indicative Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I am loved.	1. We are loved.
2. Thou art loved.	2. Ye *or* you are loved.
3. He is loved.	3. They are loved.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I was loved.	1. We were loved.
2. Thou wast loved.	2. Ye *or* you were loved.
3. He was loved.	3. They were loved.

PERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I have been loved.	1. We have been loved.
2. Thou hast been loved.	2. Ye *or* you have been loved.
3. He hath *or* has been loved.	3. They have been loved.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I had been loved.	1. We had been loved.
2. Thou hadst been loved.	2. Ye *or* you had been loved.
3. He had been loved.	3. They had been loved.

FIRST FUTURE TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I shall *or* will be loved.	1. We shall *or* will be loved.
2. Thou shalt *or* wilt be loved.	2. Ye *or* you shall *or* will be loved.
3. He shall *or* will be loved.	3. They shall *or* will be loved.

SECOND FUTURE TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I shall have been loved.	1. We shall have been loved.
2. Thou wilt have been loved.	2. Ye *or* you will have been loved.
3. He will have been loved.	3. They will have been loved.

Imperative Mood.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. Let me be loved.	1. Let us be loved.
2. Be thou loved, *or* do thou be loved.	2. Be ye *or* you loved, *or* do ye be loved.
3. Let him be loved.	3. Let them be loved.

Potential Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I may *or* can be loved.	1. We may *or* can be loved.
2. Thou mayst *or* canst be loved.	2. Ye *or* you may *or* can be loved.
3. He may *or* can be loved.	3. They may *or* can be loved.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I might, could, would, *or* should be loved.	1. We might, could, would, *or* should be loved.
2. Thou mightst, couldst, wouldst, *or* shouldst be loved.	2. Ye *or* you might, could, would, *or* should be loved.
3. He might, could, would, *or* should be loved.	3. They might, could, would, *or* should be loved.

PERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I may *or* can have been loved.	1. We may *or* can have been loved.
2. Thou mayst *or* canst have been loved.	2. Ye *or* you may *or* can have been loved.
3. He may *or* can have been loved.	3. They may *or* can have been loved.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. I might, could, would, *or* should have been loved.	1. We might, could, would, *or* should have been loved.
2. Thou mightst, couldst, wouldst, *or* shouldst have been loved.	2. Ye *or* you might, could, would, *or* should have been loved.
3. He might, could, would, *or* should have been loved.	3. They might, could, would, *or* should have been loved.

Subjunctive Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. If I be loved.	1. If we be loved.
2. If thou be loved.	2. If ye *or* you be loved.
3. If he be loved.	3. If they be loved.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
1. If I were loved.	1. If we were loved.
2. If thou wert loved.	2. If ye *or* you were loved.
3. If he were loved.	3. If they were loved.

The remaining tenses of this mood are, in general, similar to the correspondent tenses of the indicative mood. See pages 135, 136, 153, and the notes under the nineteenth rule of Syntax.

Infinitive Mood.

PRESENT TENSE.	PERFECT.
To be loved.	To have been loved.

Participles.

PRESENT.	Being loved.
PERFECT OR PASSIVE.	Loved.
COMPOUND PERFECT.	Having been loved.

When an auxiliary is joined to the participle of the principal verb, the auxiliary goes through all the variations of person and number, and the participle itself continues invariably the same. When there are two or more auxiliaries joined to the participle, the first of them only is varied according to person and number. The auxiliary *must* admits of no variation.

The neuter verb is conjugated like the active ; but as it partakes somewhat of the nature of the passive, it admits, in many instances, of the passive form, retaining still the neuter signification : as, "I am arrived ;" "I was gone ;" "I am grown." The auxiliary verb *am, was*, in this case, precisely defines the time of the action or event, but does not change the nature of it ; the passive form still expressing, not properly a passion, but only a state or condition of being.

SECTION 9.

Observations on Passive Verbs.

SOME writers on grammar assert, that there are no Passive Verbs in the English language, because we have no verbs of this kind with a peculiar termination, all of them being formed by the different tenses of the auxiliary *to be*, joined to the passive participle of the verb. This is, however, to mistake the true nature of the English verb; and to regulate it, not on the principles of our own tongue, but on those of foreign languages. The conjugation, or the variation, of the English verb, to answer all the purposes of verbs, is accomplished by the means of auxiliaries; and if it be alleged that we have no passive verbs, because we cannot exhibit them without having recourse to helping verbs, it may with equal truth be said, that we have no *perfect*, *pluperfect*, or *future tense*, in the indicative or subjunctive mood; since these, as well as some other parts of the verb active, are formed by auxiliaries.

Even the Greek and Latin passive verbs require an auxiliary to conjugate some of their tenses; namely, the former, in the preterit of the optative and subjunctive moods; and the latter, in the perfect and pluperfect of the indicative, the perfect, pluperfect, and future, of the subjunctive mood, and the perfect of the infinitive. The deponent verbs, in Latin, require also an auxiliary to conjugate several of their tenses. This statement abundantly proves, that the conjugation of a verb, in the learned languages, does not consist solely in varying the form of the original verb. It proves that these languages, like our own language, sometimes conjugate with an auxiliary, and sometimes without it. There is, indeed, a difference. What the learned languages require to be done, in some

instances, the peculiar genius of our own tongue obliges us to do, in active verbs, principally, and in passive ones, universally. In short, the variation of the verb, in Greek and Latin, is generally accomplished by prefixes, or terminations, added to the verb itself; in English, by the addition of auxiliaries.

The English tongue is, in many respects, materially different from the learned languages. It is, therefore, very possible to be mistaken ourselves, and to mislead and perplex others, by an undistinguishing attachment to the principles and arrangement of the Greek and Latin Grammarians. Much of the confusion and perplexity, which we meet with in the writings of some English Grammarians, on the subject of verbs, moods, and conjugations, has arisen from the misapplication of names. We are apt to think, that the old names must always be attached to the identical forms and things, to which they were anciently attached. But if we rectify this mistake, and properly adjust the names to the peculiar forms and nature of the things in our own language, we shall be clear and consistent in our ideas; and, consequently, better able to represent them intelligibly to those whom we wish to inform.

The observations which we have made under this head, and on the subject of the moods in another place, will not apply to the declension and cases of nouns, so as to require us to adopt names and divisions similar to those of the Greek and Latin languages: for we should then have more cases than there are prepositions in connexion with the article and noun: and after all, it would be a useless, as well as an unwieldy apparatus; since every English preposition points to, and governs, but one case, namely the objective; which is also true with respect to our governing verbs and participles. But the conjugation of an English verb in form, through all its moods and tenses, by means of auxiliaries, so far from being useless or in-

tricate, is a beautiful and regular display of it, and indispensably necessary to the language.

Some grammarians have alleged, that on the same ground that the voices, moods, and tenses, are admitted into the English tongue, in the forms for which we have contended, we should also admit the dual number, the paulo post future tense, the middle voice, and all the moods and tenses which are to be found in Greek and Latin. But this objection, though urged with much reliance on its weight, is not well founded. If the arrangement of the moods, tenses, &c. which we have adopted, is suited to the idiom of our tongue; and the principle, on which they are adopted, is extended as far as use and convenience require; where is the impropriety, in arresting our progress, and fixing our forms at the point of utility? A principle may be warrantably assumed, and carried to a precise convenient extent, without subjecting its supporters to the charge of inconsistency, for not pursuing it beyond the line of use and propriety.

The importance of giving the ingenious student clear and just ideas of the nature of *our* verbs, moods, and tenses, will apologize for the extent of the Author's remarks on these subjects, both here and elsewhere, and for his solicitude to simplify and explain them.—He thinks it has been proved, that the idiom of our tongue demands the arrangement he has given to the English verb; and that, though the learned languages, with respect to voices, moods, and tenses, are, in general, differently constructed from the English tongue, yet, in some respects, they are so similar to it, as to warrant the principle which he has adopted. See pages 117—119. 128—131. 152—154: and Note 8 under the 19th rule of Syntax.

SECTION 10.

Of Irregular Verbs.

IRREGULAR Verbs are those, which do not form their imperfect tense, and their perfect participle, by the addition of *d* or *ed* to the verb: as,

Present.	Imperfect.	Perfect Part.
I begin,	I began,	begun.
I know,	I knew,	known.

IRREGULAR VERBS ARE OF VARIOUS SORTS.

1. Such as have the present and imperfect tenses, and perfect participle, the same: as,

Present.	Imperfect.	Perfect Part.
Cost,	cost,	cost.
Put,	put,	put.

2. Such as have the imperfect tense, and perfect participle, the same: as,

Present.	Imperfect.	Perfect Part.
Abide,	abode,	abode.
Sell,	sold,	sold.

3. Such as have the imperfect tense, and perfect participle, different: as,

Present.	Imperfect.	Perfect Part.
Arise,	arose,	arisen.
Blow,	blew,	blown.

Many verbs become irregular by contraction: as, "feed, fed; leave, left:" others, by the termination *en:* as, "fall, fell, fallen:" others, by the termination *ght:* as, "buy, bought; teach, taught," &c.

The following list of the irregular verbs will, it is presumed, be found both comprehensive and accurate:

Present.	Imperfect.	Perf. or Pass. Part.
Abide,	abode,	abode.
Am,	was,	been.
Arise,	arose,	arisen.
Awake,	awoke, R.	awaked.
Bear, *to bring forth,*	bare,	born.
Bear, *to carry,*	bore,	borne.
Beat,	beat,	beaten, beat.
Begin,	began,	begun.
Bend,	bent,	bent.
Bereave,	bereft, R.	bereft, R.
Beseech,	besought,	besought.
Bid,	bid, bade,	bidden, bid.
Bind,	bound,	bound.
Bite,	bit,	bitten, bit.
Bleed,	bled,	bled.
Blow,	blew,	blown.
Break,	broke,	broken.
Breed,	bred,	bred.
Bring,	brought,	brought.
Build,	built,	built.
Burst,	burst,	burst.
Buy,	bought,	bought.
Cast,	cast,	cast.
Catch,	caught, R.	caught, R.
Chide,	chid,	chidden, chid.
Choose,	chose,	chosen.
Cleave, *to stick or adhere,*	REGULAR.	
Cleave, *to split.*	clove, *or* cleft.	cleft, cloven.
Cling,	clung,	clung.
Clothe,	clothed,	clad, R.
Come,	came,	come.
Cost,	cost,	cost.
Crow,	crew, R.	crowed.
Creep,	crept,	crept.

Present.	Imperfect.	Perf. or Pass. Part.
Cut,	cut,	cut.
Dare, *to venture*,	durst,	dared.
Dare, R. *to challenge*.		
Deal,	dealt, R.	dealt, R.
Dig,	dug, R.	dug, R.
Do,	did,	done.
Draw,	drew,	drawn.
Drive,	drove,	driven.
Drink,	drank,	drunk.
Dwell,	dwelt, R.	dwelt, R.
Eat,	eat, *or* ate,	eaten.
Fall,	fell,	fallen.
Feed,	fed,	fed.
Feel,	felt,	felt.
Fight,	fought,	fought.
Find,	found,	found.
Flee,	fled,	fled.
Fling,	flung,	flung.
Fly,	flew,	flown.
Forget,	forgot,	forgotten, forgot.
Forsake,	forsook,	forsaken *.
Freeze,	froze,	frozen.
Get,	got,	got †.
Gild,	gilt, R.	gilt, R.
Gird,	girt, R.	girt, R.
Give,	gave,	given.
Go,	went,	gone.
Grave,	graved,	graven, R.
Grind,	ground,	ground.
Grow,	grew,	grown.

* Walker observes, that Milton has availed himself of the license of his art, (an art as apt to corrupt grammar, as it is to raise and adorn language,) to use the preterit of this verb for the participle:

> " Th' immortal mind that hath *forsook*
> Her mansion."

† *Gotten* is nearly obsolete. Its compound *forgotten* is still in good use.

Perfect.	Imperfect.	Perf. or Pass. Part.
Have,	had,	had.
Hang,	hung, R.	hung, R.
Hear,	heard,	heard.
Hew,	hewed,	hewn, R.
Hide,	hid,	hid, hidden.
Hit,	hit,	hit.
Hold,	held,	held.
Hurt,	hurt,	hurt.
Keep,	kept,	kept.
Knit,	knit, R.	knit, R.
Know,	knew,	known.
Lade,	laded,	laden.
Lay,	laid,	laid.
Lead,	led,	led.
Leave,	left,	left.
Lend,	lent,	lent.
Let,	let,	let.
Lie, *to lie down*,	lay,	lain.
Load,	loaded,	laden, R.
Lose,	lost,	lost.
Make,	made,	made.
Meet,	met,	met.
Mow,	mowed,	mown, R.
Pay,	paid,	paid.
Put,	put,	put.
Read,	read,	read.
Rend,	rent,	rent.
Rid,	rid,	rid.
Ride,	rode,	rode, ridden*.
Ring	rung, rang,	rung.
Rise,	rose,	risen.
Rive	rived,	riven.
Run,	ran,	run.
Saw,	sawed,	sawn, R.
Say,	said,	said.
See,	saw,	seen.

* *Ridden* is nearly obsolete.

Present.	Imperfect.	Perf. or Pass. Part.
Seek,	sought,	sought.
Sell,	sold,	sold.
Send,	sent,	sent.
Set,	set,	set.
Shake,	shook,	shaken.
Shape,	shaped,	shaped, shapen.
Shave,	shaved,	shaven, R.
Shear,	sheared,	shorn.
Shed,	shed,	shed.
Shine,	shone, R.	shone, R.
Show,	showed,	shown.
Shoe,	shod,	shod.
Shoot,	shot,	shot.
Shrink,	shrunk,	shrunk.
Shred,	shred,	shred.
Shut,	shut,	shut.
Sing,	sung, sang,	sung.
Sink,	sunk, sank,	sunk.
Sit,	sat,	sat.
Slay,	slew,	slain.
Sleep,	slept,	slept.
Slide,	slid,	slidden.
Sling,	slung,	slung.
Slink,	slunk,	slunk.
Slit,	slit, R.	slit, *or* slitted.
Smite,	smote.	smitten.
Sow,	sowed,	sown, R.
Speak,	spoke,	spoken.
Speed,	sped,	sped.
Spend,	spent,	spent.
Spill,	spilt, R.	spilt, R.
Spin,	spun,	spun.
Spit,	spit, spat,	spit, spitten*.
Split,	split,	split.
Spread,	spread,	spread.
Spring,	sprung, sprang,	sprung.

* *Spitten* is nearly obsolete.

Present.	Imperfect.	Perf. or Pass. Part.
Stand,	stood,	stood.
Steal,	stole,	stolen.
Stick,	stuck,	stuck.
Sting,	stung,	stung.
Stink,	stunk,	stunk.
Stride,	strode *or* strid,	stridden.
Strike,	struck,	struck *or* stricken.
String,	strung,	strung.
Strive,	strove,	striven.
Strow *or* strew,	strowed *or* strewed,	strown, strowed, strewed.
Swear,	swore,	sworn.
Sweat,	swet, R.	swet, R.
Swell,	swelled,	swollen, R.
Swim,	swum, swam,	swum.
Swing,	swung,	swung.
Take,	took,	taken.
Teach,	taught,	taught.
Tear,	tore,	torn.
Tell,	told,	told.
Think,	thought,	thought.
Thrive,	throve, R.	thriven.
Throw,	threw,	thrown.
Thrust,	thrust,	thrust.
Tread,	trod,	trodden.
Wax,	waxed,	waxen, R.
Wear,	wore,	worn.
Weave,	wove,	woven.
Weep,	wept,	wept.
Win,	won,	won.
Wind,	wound,	wound.
Work,	wrought,	wrought *or* worked.
Wring,	wrung,	wrung.
Write,	wrote,	written.

In the preceding list, some of the verbs will be found to be conjugated regularly, as well as irregularly; and those which admit of the regular form are marked with an R.

There is a preference to be given to some of these, which custom and judgment must determine. Those preterits and participles which are first mentioned in the list, seem to be the most eligible. The Compiler has not inserted such verbs as are irregular only in familiar writing or discourse, and which are improperly terminated by *t*, instead of *ed*: as learnt, spelt, spilt, &c. These should be avoided in every sort of composition. It is, however, proper to observe, that some contractions of *ed* into *t*, are unexceptionable; and others, the only established forms of expression: as crept, dwelt, gilt, &c.: and lost, felt, slept, &c. These allowable and necessary contractions must therefore be carefully distinguished by the learner, from those that are exceptionable. The words which are obsolete have also been omitted, that the learner might not be induced to mistake them for words in present use. Such are, wreathen, drunkèn, holpen, molten, gotten, holden, bounden, &c.: and swang, wrang, slank, strawed, gat, brake, tare, ware, &c.

Section 11.

Of Defective Verbs; and of the different ways in which verbs are conjugated.

Defective Verbs are those which are used only in some of their moods and tenses.

The principal of them are these.

Present.	Imperfect.	Perf. or Pass. Part.
Can,	could,	———
May,	might,	———
Shall,	should,	———
Will,	would,	———
Must,	must,	———
Ought,	ought,	———
———	quoth,	———

That the verbs *must* and *ought* have both a present and past signification, appears from the following sentences: "I must now own that I was to blame;" "He must, at that time, have been mistaken;" "We ought to do our duty, and leave the consequences;" "They spoke things which they ought not then to have spoken."

If it should be objected that the words *must* and *ought*, in the preceding sentences, are all in the present tense; on the ground, that the expression, "He must, at that time, have been mistaken," implies, "It *is* necessary, it *is* certain, he was at that time mistaken;" and that the sentence, "They spoke things which they ought not then to have spoken," signifies that, "They spoke things which it *is* a duty incumbent upon them, not then to have spoken:" we may reply that, on this principle, the true grammatical construction of sentences, may be often strangely perverted. From a similar mode of reasoning, the words *may*, *might*, *could*, in the following sentences, may be considered as in the present tense; "I *may*, at that time, have been mistaken;" "He *might* have decided better;" "They *could* have finished the work sooner:" since *may*, *might*, *could*, may be converted into, "It *is possible* that I was, at that time, mistaken;" "It *is possible* for him to have decided better;" "It *is possible* for them to have finished the work sooner."—We have shown at pages 109, 110, of this work, that one phrase may, in point of sense, be equivalent to another, though its grammatical nature is essentially different.

If it be further objected, that the expression, "He must have been deceived," is as incorrect and absurd as the phrase, "He intended to have written," we presume that the objection is wholly destitute of foundation. As the word *must*, in the sentence in question, is used as an auxiliary verb, there appears to be no impropriety in connecting it with the subsequent form of the verb. It is as justifiable and regular as the helping verbs and their con-

nexions are, in the following sentences; "He *may* have been deceived;" "He *might* have done better;" "He *could* not have done worse."—With regard to the phrase, "He ought, when the officer appeared, to have surrendered himself;" we observe that when we use this verb *ought*, this is the only possible way to distinguish the past from the present. See the Sixth paragraph of the Thirteenth Rule of Syntax.

To attempt the support of the preceding objections, if that could support them, by a partial construction of the English verb, and considering it, in no part of its formation, as composed of the participle and its auxiliary, would be to take that for granted which is disputed; to resort to an hypothesis which, we presume, has already been sufficiently controverted, and shown to be untenable.

In most languages, there are some verbs which are defective with respect to persons. These are denominated *impersonal* verbs. They are used only in the third person, because they refer to a subject peculiarly appropriated to that person: as, "It rains, it snows, it hails, it lightens, it thunders." But as the word *impersonal* implies a total absence of persons, it is improperly applied to those verbs which have a person: and hence it is manifest, that there is no such thing in English, nor indeed, in any language, as a sort of verbs really impersonal*.

---

* The plea urged to prove the existence of Impersonal Verbs is, in substance, as follows: and the reader will perceive that it is not wholly destitute of plausibility.—There are certain verbs, which do not admit for their subject any thing that has life, or any thing that is strictly definable: such as, "It snows, it hails, it freezes, it rains, it lightens, it thunders." In this point of view, and with this explanation, it is supposed, by some grammarians, that our language contains a few Impersonal Verbs; that is, verbs which declare the existence of some action or state, but which do not refer it to any animate being, or any determinate particular subject.

The whole number of verbs in the English language, regular and irregular, simple and compounded, taken together, is about 4300. The number of irregular verbs, the defective included, is about 177.

Some Grammarians have thought that the English verbs, as well as those of the Greek, Latin, French, and other languages, might be classed into several conjugations; and that the three different terminations of the participle might be the distinguishing characteristics. They have accordingly proposed three conjugations; namely, the first to consist of verbs, the participles of which end in *ed*, or its contraction *t;* the second, of those ending in *ght;* and the third, of those in *en*. But as the verbs of the first conjugation, would so greatly exceed in number those of both the others, as may be seen by the preceding account of them; and as those of the third conjugation are so various in their form, and incapable of being reduced to one plain rule; it seems better in practice, as Dr. Lowth justly observes, to consider the first in *ed* as the only regular form, and the other as deviations from it; after the example of the Saxon and German Grammarians.

Before we close this section, it may afford instruction to the learners, to be informed, more particularly than they have been, that different nations have made use of different contrivances for marking the tenses and moods of their verbs. The Greeks and Latins distinguish them, as well as the cases of their nouns, adjectives, and participles, by varying the termination, or otherwise changing the form, of the word; retaining, however, those radical letters, which prove the inflection to be of the same kindred with its root. The modern tongues, particularly the English, abound in auxiliary words, which vary the meaning of the noun, or the verb, without requiring any considerable varieties of inflection. Thus, *I do love, I did love, I have loved, I had loved, I shall love,* have the same import as *amo, amabam, amavi, amaveram,*

amabo. It is obvious, that a language, like the Greek and Latin, which can thus comprehend in one word the meaning of two or three words, must have some advantages over those which are not so comprehensive. Perhaps, indeed, it may not be more perspicuous; but in the arrangement of words, and consequently in harmony and energy, as well as in conciseness, it may be much more elegant.

Section 12.

Theory respecting the Inflections of language.

In our modern verbs and nouns, says Dr. Beattie, the variety of auxiliary words, is much greater than in the language of Greece or Rome. The northern nations, who overturned the Roman empire, and established themselves in the conquered provinces, being an unlettered race of men, would not take the trouble, either to impart their own language to the Romans, or to learn theirs with any degree of exactness: but, blending words and idioms of their own with Latin words inaccurately acquired, or imperfectly remembered, and finding it too great a labour to master all the inflections of that language, fell upon a simpler, though less elegant, artifice, of supplying the place of cases, moods, and tenses, with one or more auxiliary words, joined to nouns, verbs, and participles. And hence, in the Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and French languages, the greater part of the words are Latin; (for the conquered were more in number than the conquerors;) but so disguised are those words, by the mixture of northern idioms, and by the slovenly expedient now hinted at, as to have become at once like the Latin, and very different from it.—The ancient Greek, compared with the modern, is found to have undergone alterations somewhat similar, but not so

great. For with the northern invaders the Greeks were never so thoroughly incorporated, as were the Europeans of the West: and, when conquered by the Turks, they maintained their religion, and so preserved their language from total depravation, though they could not prevent its debasement.

On many topics, it is easier to propose than to solve difficulties; and to ask questions, than to answer them. What is hinted in the last paragraph, may be thought to account for the multitude of auxiliary words that belong to the verbs and nouns of modern Europe. But, for the multitude of *Inflections*, that are found in the nouns and verbs of the ancient languages, how are we to account? Why did not the Greeks and Romans abound in auxiliary words as much as we?

Was it because their languages, like regular towns and fortifications, were *made* by men of learning; who planned them before they existed, with a view to the renown of the poets, philosophers, and orators, who were to compose in them, as well as to the convenience of the people, who were to speak them: while the modern tongues, like poor villages that extend their bounds irregularly, are the rude work of a barbarous people, who, without looking before or behind them, on the right hand, or on the left, threw their coarse materials together, with no other view, than just to answer the exigency of the present hour?—This theory is agreeable to the ideas of some learned authors. But if we pay any regard to history, or believe that human exertions are proportioned to human abilities, and that the Greeks and Romans were like other men, we cannot acquiesce in it.

They who first spoke Greek and Latin were certainly not less ignorant, nor less savage, than were those moderns, among whom arose the Italian, the Spanish, the French, and the English languages. If these last

were formed gradually, and without plan or method, why should we believe, that the Classic tongues were otherwise formed? Are they more regular than the modern? In some respects they may be so; and it is allowed that they are more elegant: for, of two towns that are built without a plan, it is not difficult to imagine, that the one may be more convenient and more beautiful than the other. But every polite tongue has its own rules; and the English that is according to rule, is not less regular than the Greek that is according to rule; and a deviation from the established use of the language, is as much an irregularity in the one as in the other: nor are the modes of the Greek tongue more uniform in Xenophon and Plato, or of the Latin in Cicero and Cæsar, than those of the English are in Addison and Swift, or those of the French in Rollin, Vertot, and Fenelon.

But why should the Inflections of language be considered, as a proof of refinement and art, and the substitution of auxiliary words, as the work of chance and of barbarism? Nay, what evidence can be brought to show, that the Inflections of the Classic tongues were not originally formed out of obsolete auxiliary words prefixed, or subjoined, to nouns and verbs, or otherwise incorporated with their radical letters? Some learned men are of opinion, that this was actually the case. And though the matter does not now admit of a direct proof, the analogy of other languages, ancient as well as modern, gives plausibility to the conjecture.

The inflections of Hebrew nouns and verbs may, upon this principle, be accounted for. The cases of the former, are marked by a change made in the beginning of the word; and this change is nothing more than a contracted preposition prefixed, answering to the English *of*, *to*, *from:* as if, instead of *animal*, *of animal*, *to animal*, *from animal*, we were to pronounce and write *animal*, *fanimal*, *tanimal*, *franimal;* which, if we were ac-

customed to speak so, would be as intelligible to us, as *animal*, *anamalis*, *animali*, were to the Romans.—Of the Hebrew verb, in like manner, the persons are marked by contracted pronouns subjoined or prefixed to the radical letters. Thus, *masar*, he delivered; *masartha*, thou deliveredst, from *masar*, the root, and *atha*, thou; *masarthi*, I delivered, from *masar*, and *aothi*, me, &c. And in Erse, a very ancient species of Celtic, most of the inflections of the nouns and verbs may, if I am not misinformed, be analysed in a way somewhat similar.

If the English, and other modern tongues, had been spoken for ages before they were written, (which we have reason to think was the case with the Greek and Latin,) it is probable that many of our auxiliaries would have been shortened and softened; and at length incorporated with the radical words, so as to assume the form of initial or final inflections. For it is while they are only spoken and not written, that languages are most liable to alterations of this kind; as they become, in some degree, stationary from the time they begin to be visible in writing. But we know that writing was practised in many, and perhaps in most European nations, previously to the very existence of the modern languages: from which we may infer, that attempts would be made to write those languages almost as soon as to speak them. And if thus our auxiliary words were kept distinct in the beginning, and marked as such by our first writers, it is no wonder that they should have remained distinct ever since.

Had the Greek and Latin tongues been ascertained by writing, at as early a period of their existence, their fate would perhaps have been similar: and their inflections might now, like those of the Hebrew, have been easily analysed; and found to be auxiliary words shortened and softened by colloquial use, and gradually

incorporated with the radical part of the original nouns and verbs. But it was the misfortune of the modern languages, (if it can be called a misfortune,) that their form was, in some measure, fixed before it became so complete as it might have been; that without passing through the intermediate stages of childhood and youth, they rose at once (if I may so speak) from infancy to premature manhood: and in regard to the Classic tongues, it was a fortunate circumstance, that their growth advanced more gradually, and that their form was not established by writing, till after it had been variously rounded and moulded by the casual pronunciation of successive ages. Hence, if there be any truth in these conjectures, (for they lay claim to no higher character,) it will follow that the Greek and Latin tongues are for this reason peculiarly elegant, because they who first spoke them were long in a savage state; and that the modern languages are for this reason less elegant, because the nations among whom they took their rise, were not savage. This looks very like a paradox. And yet, is it not more probable, than any thing which can be advanced in favour of that contrary supposition, adopted by some learned men, that the Classic tongues were planned by philosophers, and the modern languages jumbled rudely into form by barbarians?

The preceding theory of Dr. Beattie, though modestly offered by him as conjecture only, appears to be well founded, and entitled to considerable respect and attention. It is a curious discussion; and well adapted to lead the student to critical reflections, and to further inquiries, respecting the nature and origin of the Inflections of language.

CHAPTER VII.

OF ADVERBS.

An Adverb is a part of speech joined to a verb, an adjective, and sometimes to another adverb, to express some quality or circumstance respecting it: as, "He reads *well*;" "A *truly* good man;" "He writes *very correctly*."

Some adverbs are compared, thus; "Soon, sooner, soonest;" "often, oftener, oftenest." Those ending in *ly*, are compared by *more*, and *most*: as, "Wisely, more wisely, most wisely."

Adverbs seem originally to have been contrived to express compendiously in one word, what must otherwise have required two or more: as, "He acted wisely," for, he acted with wisdom; "prudently," for, with prudence; "He did it here," for, he did it in this place; "exceedingly," for, to a great degree; "often and seldom," for many, and for few times; "very," for, in an eminent degree, &c.—Phrases which do the office of adverbs may properly be termed adverbial phrases: as, "He acted in the best manner possible." Here, the words *in the best manner possible*, as they qualify the verb *acted*, may be called an adverbial phrase.

There are many words, in the English language, that are sometimes used as adjectives, and sometimes as adverbs: as, "More men than women were there;" or, "I am more diligent than he." In the former sentence *more* is evidently an adjective, and in the latter, an adverb. There are others that are sometimes used as substantives, and

sometimes as adverbs: as, "To-day's lesson is longer than yesterday's;" here *to-day* and *yesterday* are substantives, because they are words that make sense of themselves, and admit besides of a genitive case: but in the phrase, "He came home yesterday, and sets out again to-day," they are adverbs of time; because they answer to the question *when.* The adverb *much* is used as all three: as, "Where much is given, much is required;" "Much money has been expended;" "It is much better to go than to stay." In the first of these sentences, *much* is a substantive; in the second, it is an adjective; and in the third, an adverb. In short, nothing but the sense can determine what they are.

Adverbs, though very numerous, may be reduced to certain classes, the chief of which are those of Number, Order, Place, Time, Quantity, Manner or Quality, Doubt, Affirmation, Negation, Interrogation, and Comparison.

1. Of *number:* as, "Once, twice, thrice," &c.

2. Of *order:* as, "First, secondly, thirdly, fourthly, fifthly, lastly, finally," &c.

3. Of *place:* as, "Here, there, where, elsewhere, anywhere, somewhere, nowhere, herein, whither, hither, thither, upward, downward, forward, backward, whence, hence, thence, whithersoever," &c.

4. Of *time.*

Of *time present:* as, "Now, to-day," &c.

Of *time past:* as, "Already, before, lately, yesterday, heretofore, hitherto, long since, long ago," &c.

Of *time to come:* as, "To-morrow, not yet, hereafter, henceforth, henceforward, by and by, instantly, presently, immediately, straightways," &c.

Of *time indefinite:* as, "Oft, often, oft-times, oftentimes, sometimes, soon, seldom, daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, always, when, then, ever, never, again," &c.

5. Of *quantity:* as, "Much, little, sufficiently, how much, how great, enough, abundantly," &c.

6. Of *manner* or *quality:* as, "Wisely, foolishly, justly, unjustly, quickly, slowly," &c. Adverbs of quality are the most numerous kind; and they are generally formed by adding the termination *ly* to an adjective or participle, or changing *le* into *ly:* as, "Bad, badly; cheerful, cheerfully; able, ably; admirable, admirably."

7. Of *doubt:* as, "Perhaps, peradventure, possibly, perchance."

8. Of *affirmation:* as, "Verily, truly, undoubtedly, doubtless, certainly, yea, yes, surely, indeed, really," &c.

9. Of *negation:* as, "Nay, no, not, by no means, not at all, in no wise," &c.

10. Of *interrogation:* as, "How, why, wherefore, whether," &c.

11. Of *comparison:* as, "More, most, better, best, worse, worst, less, least, very, almost, little, alike," &c.

Besides the adverbs already mentioned, there are many which are formed by a combination of several of the prepositions with the adverbs of place *here, there,* and *where:* as, "Hereof, thereof, whereof; hereto, thereto, whereto; hereby, thereby, whereby; herewith, therewith, wherewith; herein, therein, wherein; therefore, (i. e. there-for,) wherefore, (i. e. where-for,) hereupon, or hereon, thereupon, or thereon, whereupon, or whereon, &c. Except *therefore,* these are seldom used.

In some instances the preposition suffers no change, but becomes an adverb merely by its application: as when we say, "he rides *about;*" "he was *near* falling;" "but do not *after* lay the blame on me."

There are also some adverbs, which are composed of nouns, and the letter *a* used instead of *at, on,* &c: as, "Aside, athirst, afoot, ahead, asleep, aboard, ashore, abed, aground, afloat," &c.

The words *when* and *where,* and all others of the same nature, such as, *whence, whither, whenever, wherever,* &c. may be properly called *adverbial conjunctions,* because they

participate the nature both of adverbs and conjunctions: of conjunctions, as they conjoin sentences; of adverbs, as they denote the attributes either of *time*, or of *place*.

It may be particularly observed, with respect to the word *therefore*, that it is an adverb, when, without joining sentences, it only gives the sense of, *for that reason*. When it gives that sense, and also connects, it is a conjunction: as, "He is good, *therefore* he is happy." The same observation may be extended to the words *consequently*, *accordingly*, and the like. When these are subjoined to *and*, or joined to *if*, *since*, &c. they are adverbs, the connexion being made without their help: when they appear single, and unsupported by any other connective, they may be called conjunctions.

The inquisitive scholar may naturally ask, what necessity there is for *adverbs of time*, when verbs are provided with *tenses*, to show that circumstance. The answer is, though tenses may be sufficient to denote the greater distinctions of time, yet, to denote them all by the tenses would be a perplexity without end. What a variety of forms must be given to the verb, to denote *yesterday*, *to-day*, *to-morrow*, *formerly*, *lately*, *just now*, *now*, *immediately*, *presently*, *soon*, *hereafter*, &c. It was this consideration that made the adverbs of time necessary, over and above the tenses.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF PREPOSITIONS.

PREPOSITIONS serve to connect words with one another, and to show the relation between them. They are, for the most part, put before nouns and pronouns: as, "He went *from* London *to* York;" "She is *above* disguise;" "They are instructed *by* him."

The following is a list of the principal prepositions:

Of	into	above	at	off
to	within	below	near	on *or* upon
for	without	between	up	among
by	over	beneath	down	after
with	under	from	before	about
in	through	beyond	behind	against

Verbs are often compounded of a verb and a preposition: as, to uphold, to invest, to overlook: and this composition sometimes gives a new sense to the verb: as, to understand, to withdraw, to forgive. But in English, the preposition is more frequently placed after the verb: and separately from it, like an adverb; in which situation it is not less apt to affect the sense of it, and to give it a new meaning; and may still be considered as belonging to the verb, and as a part of it. As, *to cast*, is to throw: but *to cast up*, or to compute, *an account*, is quite a different thing: thus, to fall on, to bear out, to give over, &c. So that the meaning of the verb, and the propriety of the phrase,

depend on the preposition subjoined. As the distinct component parts of these words, are, however, no guide to the sense of the whole, this circumstance contributes greatly towards making our language peculiarly difficult to foreigners.

In the composition of many words, there are certain syllables employed, which grammarians have called inseparable prepositions: as, *be, con, mis,* &c. in bedeck, conjoin, mistake: but as they are not words of any kind, they cannot properly be called a species of preposition.

One great use of prepositions, in English, is, to express those relations, which, in some languages, are chiefly marked by cases, or the different endings of nouns. See page 85. The necessity and use of them will appear from the following examples. If we say, "he writes a pen," "they ran the river," "the tower fell the Greeks," "Lambeth is Westminster-abbey," there is observable, in each of these expressions, either a total want of connexion, or such a connexion as produces falsehood or nonsense: and it is evident, that, before they can be turned into sense, the vacancy must be filled up by some connecting word: as thus, "He writes *with* a pen;" "they ran *towards* the river;" "the tower fell *upon* the Greeks;" "Lambeth is *over against* Westminster-abbey." We see by these instances, how prepositions may be necessary to connect those words, which in their signification are not naturally connected.

Prepositions, in their original and literal acceptation, seem to have denoted relations of place; but they are now used *figuratively* to express other relations. For example, as they who are *above* have, in several respects, the advantage of such as are *below*, prepositions expressing high and low places, are used for superiority and inferiority in general: as, "He is *above* disguise;" "we serve *under* a good master;" "he rules *over* a willing people;" "we should do nothing *beneath* our character."

The importance of the prepositions will be further perceived by the explanation of a few of them.

Of denotes possession or belonging, an effect or consequence, and other relations connected with these: as, "The house *of* my friend;" that is, "the house belonging to my friend;" "He died *of* a fever;" that is, "in consequence of a fever."

To or *unto*, is opposed to *from*: as, "He rode from Salisbury *to* Winchester."

For indicates the cause or motive of any action or circumstance, &c.: as, "He loves her *for* (that is, on account of) her amiable qualities."

By is generally used with reference to the cause, agent, means, &c.: as, "He was killed *by* a fall;" that is, "a fall was the cause of his being killed;" "This house was built *by* him;" that is, "he was the builder of it."

With denotes the act of accompanying, uniting, &c.: as, "We will go *with* you;" "They are on good terms *with* each other."—*With* also alludes to the instrument or means: as, "He was cut *with* a knife."

In relates to time, place, the state or manner of being or acting, &c.: as, "He was born *in* (that is, during) the year 1720;" "He dwells *in* the city;" "She lives *in* affluence."

Into is used after verbs that imply motion of any kind: as, "He retired *into* the country;" "Copper is converted *into* brass."

Within, relates to something comprehended in any place or time: as, "They are *within* the house;" "He began and finished his work *within* the limited time."

The signification of *without* is opposite to that of *within*: as, "She stands *without* the gate:" But it is more frequently opposed to *with*: as, "You may go *without* me."

The import and force of the remaining prepositions will be readily understood, without a particular detail of

them. We shall, therefore, conclude this head with observing, that there is a peculiar propriety in distinguishing the use of the prepositions *by* and *with;* which is observable in sentences like the following: "He walks *with* a staff *by* moonlight;" "He was taken *by* stratagem, and killed *with* a sword." Put the one preposition for the other, and say, "he walks *by* a staff *with* moonlight;" "he was taken *with* stratagem, and killed *by* a sword;" and it will appear, that they differ in signification more than one, at first view, would be apt to imagine.

Some of the prepositions have the appearance and effect of conjunctions: as, "*After* their prisons were thrown open," &c. "*Before* I die;" "They made haste to be prepared *against* their friends arrived:" but if the noun *time*, which is understood, be added, they will lose their conjunctive form: as, "After [the time when] their prisons," &c.

The prepositions *after*, *before*, *above*, *beneath*, and several others, sometimes appear to be adverbs, and may be so considered: as, "They had their reward soon *after;*" "He died not long *before;*" "He dwells *above:*" but if the nouns *time* and *place* be added, they will lose their adverbial form: as, "He died not long *before that time*," &c.

Prepositions, as well as some other species of words, have a variety of significations. It will both gratify and instruct the inquisitive learner, to examine some of the various meanings which are attached to the preposition FOR. He will find, that each of the phrases denoting these meanings, may, with propriety, be substituted for the preposition.

1. It signifies, *because of:* as, "Let me sing praises *for* his mercies and blessings."
2. *With regard to, with respect to:* as, "*For* me, no other happiness I own."

3. *In the character of:* as, "Let her go *for* an ungrateful woman."
4. *By means of; by interposition of:* as, "If it were not *for* Divine Providence, the world would be a scene of confusion."
5. *For the sake of:* as, "He died *for* those who knew him not."
6. *Conducive to:* as, "It is *for* the general good."
7. *With intention of going to a certain place:* as, "We sailed from Peru *for* China."
8. *In expectation of:* as, "He waited long *for* the return of his friend."
9. *Instead of:* as, "We take a falling meteor *for* a star."
10. *In search of:* as, "He went far back *for* arguments."
11. *In favour of:* as, "One party was *for* the king; the other *for* the people."
12. *Becoming:* as, "It were more *for* his honour to submit on this occasion."
13. *Notwithstanding:* as, "*For* any thing we know to the contrary, the design may be accomplished."
14. *To preserve:* as, "I cannot *for* my life comply with the proposal."
15. *In proportion to:* as, "He is not very tall, yet *for* his years he is tall."
16. *For the purpose of:* as, "It was constructed *for* sailing in rough weather."
17. *To be:* as, "No one ever took him *for* a very prudent man."
18. *In illustration of:* as, "Thus much, *for* the first point under consideration."
19. *In exchange for:* as, "They received gold *for* their glass beads."
20. *During:* as, "He was elected to the office *for* his life."

21. *In recompense of:* as, "*For* his great and numerous services, they voted him a statue."

22. After O, it denotes *an expression of desire:* as, "O, *for* better times:" "O, *for* a place of rest and peace."

Before the conclusion of this chapter, we shall present the reader with a list of Prepositions, which are derived from the Latin and Greek languages, and which enter into the composition of a great number of our words. If their signification should be carefully studied by the learner, he will be the better qualified to understand, with accuracy, the meaning of a numerous class of words, in which they form a material part.

The Latin prepositions used in the composition of English words, are the following: *a*, *abs*, *ad*, *ante*, &c.

A, AB, ABS,—signify *from* or *away:* as, to *avert*, to turn from; to *abstract*, to draw away.

AD—signifies *to* or *at:* as, to *adhere*, to stick to; to *admire*, to wonder at.

ANTE—means *before:* as, *antecedent*, going before; to *antedate*, to date before.

CIRCUM—means *round*, *about:* as, to *circumnavigate*, to sail round.

CON, COM, CO, COL,—signify *together:* as, to *conjoin*, to join together; to *compress*, to press together; to *co-operate*, to work together; to *collapse*, to fall together.

CONTRA—*against:* as, to *contradict*, to speak against.

DE—signifies *from*, *down:* as, to *depart*, to retire from; to *deject*, to cast down.

DI—*asunder:* as, *dilacerate*, to tear asunder.

DIS—reverses the meaning of the word to which it is prefixed: as, to disagree, to dispossess.

E, EX—*out:* as, to *eject*, to throw out; to *exclude*, to shut out.

EXTRA—*beyond:* as, *extraordinary*, beyond the ordinary course.

IN—before an adjective, like *un*, signifies privation: as, *indecent*, not decent; before a verb it has its simple meaning; as, to *infuse*, to pour in; to *infix*, to fix in.

INTER—*between:* as, to *intervene*, to come between; to *interpose*, to put between.

INTRO—*into, inwards:* as, to *introduce*, to lead into; to *introvert*, to turn inwards.

OB—denotes opposition: as, to *object*, to oppose; to *obstruct*, to block up; *obstacle*, something standing in opposition.

PER—*through:* as, to *perambulate*, to walk through; to *perforate*, to bore through.

POST—*after:* as, *post meridian*, afternoon; *Postscript*, written after, that is, after the letter.

PRÆ—*before:* as, to *pre-exist*, to exist before; to *prefix*, to fix before.

PRO—*forth* or *forwards:* as, to *protend*, to stretch forth; to *project*, to shoot forwards.

PRÆTER—*past*, or *beyond:* as, *preterperfect*, pastperfect; *preternatural*, beyond the course of nature.

RE—*again*, or *back:* as, to *reprint*, to print again; to *retrace*, to trace back.

RETRO—*backwards:* as, *retrospective*, looking backwards; *retrograde*, going backwards.

SE—*aside, apart:* as, to *seduce*, to draw aside; to *secrete*, to put aside.

SUB—*under:* as, *subterranean*, lying under the earth; to *subscribe*, to *subsign*, to write under.

SUBTER—*under:* as, *subterfluous*, flowing under.

SUPER—*above*, or *over*: as, *superscribe*, to write above; to *supervise*, to overlook.

TRANS—*over, beyond, from one place to another*: as, to *transport*, to carry over; to *transgress*, to pass beyond; to *transplant*, to remove from one soil to another.

The Greek prepositions and particles used in the composition of English words, are the following: *a, amphi, anti, hyper*, &c.

A—signifies privation: as, *anonymous*, without a name.

AMPHI—*both*, or *the two*: as, *amphibious*, partaking of both, or of two natures.

ANTI—*against*: as, *antimonarchical*, against government by a single person; *antiministerial*, against the ministry.

HYPER—*over and above*: as, *hypercritical*, over, or too critical.

HYPO—*under*, implying concealment, or disguise: as, *hypocrite*, one dissembling his real character.

META—denotes change or transmutation: as, to *metamorphose*, to change the shape.

PERI—*round about*: as, *periphrasis*, circumlocution.

SYN, SYM—*together*: as, *synod*, a meeting, or coming together; *sympathy*, fellowfeeling, feeling together.

CHAPTER IX.

OF CONJUNCTIONS.

A CONJUNCTION is a part of speech that is chiefly used to connect sentences; so as, out of two or more sentences, to make but one. It sometimes connects only words.

Conjunctions are principally divided into two sorts, the COPULATIVE and the DISJUNCTIVE.

The Conjunctive Copulative serves to connect or to continue a sentence, by expressing an addition, a supposition, a cause, &c.: as, "He *and* his brother reside in London;" "I will go *if* he will accompany me;" "You are happy, *because* you are good."

The Conjunction Disjunctive serves, not only to connect and continue the sentence, but also to express opposition of meaning in different degrees: as, "*Though* he was frequently reproved, *yet* he did not reform;" "They came with her, *but* they went away without her."

The following is a list of the principal conjunctions:

The *Copulative.* And, if, that, both, then, since, for, because, therefore, wherefore.

The *Disjunctive.* But, or, nor, as, than, lest, though, unless, either, neither, yet, notwithstanding.

The same word is occasionally used both as a conjunction and as an adverb; and sometimes, as a preposition. "I rest *then* upon this argument;" *then* is here a conjunc-

tion: in the following phrase, it is an adverb: "He arrived *then*, and not before." "I submitted; *for* it was vain to resist:" in this sentence, *for* is a conjunction; in the next, it is a preposition: "He contended *for* victory only." In the first of the following sentences, *since* is a conjunction; in the second, it is a preposition; and in the third, an adverb: "*Since* we must part, let us do it peaceably:" "I have not seen him *since* that time:" "Our friendship commenced long *since*."

Relative pronouns, as well as conjunctions, serve to connects sentences: as, "Blessed is the man *who* feareth the Lord, *and* keepeth his commandments."

A relative pronoun possesses the force both of a pronoun and a connective. Nay, the union by relatives is rather closer, than that by mere conjunctions. The latter may form two or more sentences into one; but, by the former, several sentences may incorporate in one and the same *clause* of a sentence. Thus, "thou seest a man, *and* he is called Peter," is a sentence consisting of two distinct clauses, united by the copulative *and:* but, "the man *whom* thou seest is called Peter," is a sentence of one clause, and not less comprehensive than the other.

Conjunctions very often unite sentences, when they appear to unite only words; as in the following instances: "Duty *and* interest forbid vicious indulgences;" Wisdom *or* folly governs us." Each of these forms of expression contains two sentences, namely; "Duty forbids vicious indulgences; interest forbids vicious indulgences;" "Wisdom governs us, or folly governs us."

Though the conjunction is commonly used to connect sentences together, yet, on some occasions, it merely connects words, not sentences: as, "The king *and* queen are an amiable pair;" where the affirmation cannot refer to each; it being absurd to say, that the *king*, or the *queen*

only is an amiable pair. So in the instances, "two *and* two are four;" "the fifth *and* sixth volumes will complete the set of books." Prepositions also, as before observed, connect words; but they do it to show the relation which the connected words have to each other: conjunctions when they unite words only, are designed to show the relations, which those words, so united, have to other parts of the sentence.

As there are many conjunctions and connective phrases appropriated to the coupling of sentences, that are never employed in joining the members of a sentence; so there are several conjunctions appropriated to the latter use, which are never employed in the former; and some that are equally adapted to both those purposes: as, *again, further, besides,* &c. of the first kind; *than, lest, unless, that, so that,* &c. of the second; and *but, and, for, therefore,* &c. of the last.

We shall close this chapter with a few observations on the peculiar use and advantage of the conjunction; a subject which will, doubtless, give pleasure to the ingenious student, and expand his views of the importance of his grammatical studies. The observations are taken from Dr. Beattie.

Conjunctions are those parts of language, which, by joining sentences in various ways, mark the connexions, and various dependences, of human thought. And therefore, if our thoughts be really connected and mutually dependent, it is most likely, (as every man in speaking and writing wishes to do justice to his ideas,) that conjunctions will be employed, to make that connexion, and those dependences, obvious to ourselves, and to others. And where there is, in any discourse, a remarkable deficiency of connecting particles, it may be presumed, either that there is a want of connexion, or that sufficient pains have not been taken to explain it.

The style of the best authors of Greece and Rome abounds in conjunctions, and other connecting words. Take any page in Cicero, especially where he speaks in his own person, and in the way of investigation, as in his books of Moral Duties; and you shall hardly see a sentence, that has not in, or near, the beginning a *but*, *besides*, *for*, *however*, *therefore*, or some other connective: by which we may instantly discover the relation, which the present sentence bears to what went before; as an inference, an objection, an illustration, a continuation, a concession, a condition, or simply as one sentiment subjoined to another by a copulative. The style of Seneca, on the other hand, and that of Tacitus, are in this respect deficient. Their sentences are short, and their connectives few; so that the mutual dependence of their thoughts is rather left to the conjecture of the reader, than expressed by the author. And hence, we are told, it was, that the emperor Caligula remarked, (though we can hardly suppose Caligula to have been capable of saying so good a thing,) that the style of Seneca was, sand without lime; meaning, that matter, or sense, was not wanting, but that there was nothing to cement that matter into one uniform and solid mass.

This uncemented composition has of late become fashionable among the French and their imitators. One of the first who introduced it was Montesquieu, an author of great learning and extraordinary penetration; who, as he resembled Tacitus in genius, seems to have admired his manner and copied his style. Like him, and like Florus, of whom also he was an admirer, he affects short sentences, in the way of aphorism; full of meaning indeed, but so concise in the expression as to be frequently ambiguous; and so far from having a regular connexion, that their place might often be changed without inconvenience. This, in philosophical writing, has a dis-

agreeable effect, both upon the memory, and upon the understanding of the reader.

First, upon his memory. Nothing tends more to impress the mind with a distinct idea of a complex object, than a strict and natural connexion of the parts. And therefore, when a discourse is not well connected, the sentiments, however just, are easily forgotten; or, if a few be remembered, yet their general scope and tendency, having never been clearly apprehended, is not remembered at all.

Secondly, upon his understanding. To read a number of detached thoughts, although it may amuse the fancy, does not sufficiently exercise the rational faculties. Of such thoughts, that only which is present is attended to; and, if we understand it, we do all that is required of us. But, when we peruse a regular investigation, wherein many sentiments are employed to illustrate or evince one leading point of doctrine, we must attend, both to the present thought and to that which went before, that we may perceive the connexion; we must also compare the several ideas together, in order to discern their agreement or disagreement, as well as the influence of all the premises in establishing the conclusion. This is a most wholesome intellectual exercise. It puts all our rational powers in motion, and inures us to a methodical way of thinking and speaking: and so quickens attention, strengthens memory, and gives direction and vigour to our inventive powers.

As the fashionable mode of unconnected composition is less improving to the mind of the reader, so it promotes a habit of inaccuracy and negligence in a writer. One of the greatest difficulties in writing is, to give a right arrangement to the several thoughts and parts, of which a discourse is made up: and that arrangement is the best, in which the several parts throw most light upon one another. But when an author thinks himself at

liberty to write without connexion, he is at little pains to arrange his ideas, but sets them down just as they occur; sometimes taking up a subject in the middle, and sometimes at the end; and often quitting one point before he has discussed it, and recurring to it again when he ought to be engaged in something else. In a word, he is apt to be more intent upon the brilliancy of particular thoughts, than upon their coherence: which is not more wise in an author, than it would be in an architect to build a house rather of round, smooth, and shining pebbles, than of stones of more homely appearance, hewn into such figures as would make them easily and firmly incorporate.

Relatives are not so useful in language, as conjunctions. The former make speech more concise; the later make it more explicit. Relatives comprehend the meaning of a pronoun and conjunction *copulative*: conjunctions, while they *couple* sentences, may also express opposition, inference, and many other relations and dependence.

Till men began to think in a train, and to carry their reasonings to a considerable length, it is not probable that they would make much use of conjunctions, or of any other connectives. Ignorant people, and children generally speak in short and separate sentences. The same thing is true of barbarous nations: and hence uncultivated languages are not well supplied with connecting articles. The Greeks were the greatest reasoners that ever appeared in the world; and their language, accordingly, abounds more than any other in connectives.

Conjunctions are not equally necessary in all sorts of writing. In poetry, where great conciseness of phrase is required, and every appearance of formality avoided, many of them would have a bad effect. In passionate language too, it may be proper to omit them because it is the nature of violent passion, to speak rather in disjointed

sentences, than in the way of inference and argument. Books of aphorisms, like the Proverbs of Solomon, have few connectives; because they instruct, not by reasoning, but in detached observations. And narrative will sometimes appear very graceful, when the circumstances are plainly told, with scarcely any other conjunction than the simple copulative *and:* which is frequently the case in the historical parts of Scripture.—When narration is full of images or events, the omission of connectives may, by crowding the principal words upon one another, give a sort of picture of hurry and tumult, and so heighten the vivacity of description. But when facts are to be traced down through their consequences, or upwards to their causes; when the complicated designs of mankind are to be laid open, or conjectures offered concerning them; when the historian argues either for the elucidation of truth, or in order to state the pleas and principles of contending parties; there will be occasion for every species of connective, as much as in philosophy itself. In fact, it is in argument, investigation, and science, that this part of speech is peculiarly and indispensably necessary.

We have observed above, (page 190) that a relative pronoun possesses the force both of a pronoun and a connective. This is a more artificial and refined construction than that, in which the common connective is simply made use of. In some very ancient languages, as the Hebrew, which have been employed chiefly for expressing plain sentiments in the plainest manner, without aiming at any elaborate length or harmony of periods, this pronoun occurs not so often, as in Greek and Latin, and those other tongues, which have been embellished by the joint labours of the philosopher and the rhetorician. When we read the first chapter of Genesis, we perceive, that this subjunctive pronoun, as it may be called, occurs but seldom; the sentences being short, particularly towards the begin-

ning, and joined for the most part by the connective. The same simplicity of composition, as we before observed, is frequent in Scripture; which in that Divine book is a great beauty, and an evidence both of its truth, and of its antiquity. For had the diction been more elaborate, it would have had too much the air of human contrivance, and of the arts of later times. But in other compositions, the same unadorned simplicity would not always be agreeable: for we are not displeased to find human decorations in a work of human art. Besides, the sentiments of inspiration support themselves by their intrinsic dignity; whereas those of men must often be supported and recommended by the graces of language. The inspired author commands our attention, and has a right to it: but other writers must sooth and amuse, in order to prevail with us to attend. The same ornaments, which we admire in a private apartment, are unseemly in a temple; and that rhetorical art, which in Virgil and Cicero is delightful, would be quite unsuitable to the majesty of Scripture."

CHAPTER X.

OF INTERJECTIONS.

INTERJECTIONS are words thrown in between the parts of a sentence, to express the passions or emotions of the speaker: as, "Oh! I have alienated my friend; alas! I fear for life:" "O virtue! how amiable thou art!"

THE English Interjections, as well as those of other languages, are comprised within a small compass. They are of different sorts, according to the different passions which they serve to express. Those which intimate earnestness or grief, are, *O! oh! ah! alas!* Such as are expressive of contempt, are, *pish! tush!* of wonder, *heigh! really! strange!* of calling, *hem! ho! soho!* of aversion or disgust, *foh! fie! away!* of a call of the attention, *lo! behold! hark!* of requesting silence, *hush! hist!* of salutation, *welcome! hail! all hail!* Besides these, many others, often in the mouths of the multitude, might be enumerated. But we have perhaps mentioned a sufficient number of them. Any word or phrase may indeed become an interjection, or, at least, it may be used as such, when it is expressed with emotion, and in an unconnected manner: as, behold! peace! strange! ungrateful creature! folly in the extreme!

Interjections are not so much the signs of thought, as of feeling. That a creature, so inured to articulate sound as man is, should acquire the habit of uttering, without reflection, certain vocal sounds, when he is assaulted by any strong passion, or becomes conscious of any intense feeling, is natural enough. Indeed, by continual practice, this habit becomes so powerful, that, in certain cases, we

should find it difficult to resist it, even if we wished to do so. When attacked by acute pain, it is hardly possible for us to refrain from saying oh! ah! &c.: and when we are astonished at any narrative or event, the words, strange! prodigious! indeed! break from us, without any effort of the will.

Interjections, though frequent in discourse, do not often occur in elegant composition. Unpractised writers, however, are apt to abound in the use of them, in order, as they imagine, to give pathos to their style: which is nearly the same as if, with the view of rendering conversation witty or humorous, one were to interrupt it with frequent peals of laughter. The appearance of violent emotion in others, does not always raise violent emotion in us: our hearts, for the most part, are more effectually subdued, by a sedate and simple utterance, than by strong interjections and theatrical gesture. At any rate, composure is more graceful than extravagance: and therefore, a multitude of these passionate words and particles will generally, at least on common occasions, savour more of levity than of dignity, of want of thought than of keen sensation. This holds in common discourse, as well as in writing. They who wish to speak often, and have little to say, are apt to abound in exclamations; *wonderful*, *amazing*, *prodigious*, *O dear*, *dear me*, *surprising*, *astonishing*, and the like: and hence the too frequent use of such words tends to breed a suspicion, that one labours under a scantiness of ideas. Interjections denoting imprecation, and those in which the Divine Name is irreverently mentioned, are always offensive to a pious mind: and the writer or speaker, who contracts a habit of introducing them, may, without breach of charity, be suspected of profaneness.

CHAPTER XI.

OF DERIVATION.

SECTION 1.

Of the various ways in which words are derived from one another.

HAVING treated of the different sorts of words, and their various modifications, which is the first part of Etymology, it is now proper to explain the methods by which one word is derived from another.

Words are derived from one another in various ways, *viz.*

1. Substantives are derived from verbs.
2. Verbs are derived from substantives, adjectives, and sometimes from adverbs.
3. Adjectives are derived from substantives.
4. Substantives are derived from adjectives.
5. Adverbs are derived from adjectives.

1. Substantives are derived from verbs: as, from "to love," comes "lover;" from "to visit, visiter;" from "to survive, surviver;" &c.

In the following instances, and in many others, it is difficult to determine, whether the verb was deduced from the noun, or the noun from the verb, *viz.* "Love, to love; hate, to hate; fear, to fear; sleep, to sleep; walk, to walk; ride, to ride; act, to act;" &c.

2. Verbs are derived from substantives, adjectives, and sometimes from adverbs: as, from the substantive *salt*, comes, "to salt;" from the adjective *warm*, "to warm;" and from the adverb *forward*, "to forward." Sometimes

they are formed by lengthening the vowel, or softening the consonant: as, from "grass, to graze;" sometimes by adding *en:* as, from "length, to lengthen;" especially to adjectives: as, from "short, to shorten," "bright, to brighten."

3. Adjectives are derived from substantives, in the following manner: Adjectives denoting plenty are derived from substantives by adding *y:* as, from "Health, healthy; wealth, wealthy; might, mighty," &c.

Adjectives denoting the matter out of which any thing is made, are derived from substantives by adding *en:* as, from "Oak, oaken; wood, wooden; wool, woollen," &c.

Adjectives denoting abundance are derived from substantives, by adding *ful:* as, from "Joy, joyful; sin, sinful; fruit, fruitful," &c.

Adjectives denoting plenty, but with some kind of diminution, are derived from substantives, by adding *some:* as, from "Light, lightsome; trouble, troublesome; toil, toilsome," &c.

Adjectives denoting want are derived from substantives, by adding *less:* as, from "Worth, worthless;" from "care, careless; joy, joyless," &c.

Adjectives denoting likeness are derived from substantives, by adding *ly:* as, from "Man, manly; earth, earthly; court, courtly," &c.

Some adjectives are derived from other adjectives, or from substantives, by adding *ish* to them; which termination, when added to adjectives, imports diminution, or lessening the quality: as, "White, whitish;" i. e. somewhat white. When added to substantives, it signifies similitude or tendency to a character: as, "Child, childish; thief, thievish."

Some adjectives are formed from substantives or verbs, by adding the termination *able;* and those adjectives signify capacity: as, "Answer, answerable; to change, changeable."

4. Substantives are derived from adjectives, sometimes by adding the termination *ness:* as, "White, whiteness; swift, swiftness:" sometimes by adding *th* or *t*, and making a small change in some of the letters: as, "Long, length; high, height."

5. Adverbs of quality are derived from adjectives, by adding *ly*, or changing *le* into *ly;* and denote the same quality as the adjectives from which they are derived: as, from "base," comes "basely;" from "slow, slowly;" from "able, ably."

There are so many other ways of deriving words from one another, that it would be extremely difficult, and nearly impossible, to enumerate them. The primitive words of any language are very few; the derivatives form much the greater number. A few more instances only can be given here.

Some substantives are derived from other substantives, by adding the terminations *hood* or *head*, *ship*, *ery*, *wick*, *rick*, *dom*, *ian*, *ment*, and *age*.

Substantives ending in *hood* or *head*, are such as signify character or qualities: as, "Manhood, knighthood, falsehood," &c.

Substantives ending in *ship*, are those that signify office, employment, state, or condition: as, "Lordship, stewardship, partnership," &c. Some substantives in *ship*, are derived from adjectives: as, "Hard, hardship," &c.

Substantives which end in *ery*, signify action or habit: as, "Slavery, foolery, prudery," &c. Some substantives of this sort come from adjectives: as, "Brave, bravery," &c.

Substantives ending in *wick*, *rick*, and *dom*, denote dominion, jurisdiction, or condition: as, "Bailiwick, bishoprick, kingdom, dukedom, freedom," &c.

Substantives which end in *ian*, are those that signify profession: as, "Physician, musician," &c. Those that end in *ment* and *age*, come generally from the French,

and commonly signify the act or habit: as, "Commandment, usage."

Some substantives ending in *ard*, are derived from verbs or adjectives, and denote character or habit: as, "Drunk, drunkard; dote, dotard."

Some substantives have the form of diminutives; but these are not many. They are formed by adding the terminations, *kin*, *ling*, *ing*, *ock*, *el*, and the like: as, "Lamb, lambkin; goose, gosling; duck, duckling; hill, hillock; cock, cockerel," &c.

That part of derivation which consists in tracing English words to the Greek, Latin, French, and other languages, must be omitted, as the English scholar is not supposed to be acquainted with these languages. The best English dictionaries will, however, furnish some information on this head, to those who are desirous of obtaining it. The learned Horne Tooke, in his "Diversions of Purley," has given an ingenious account of the derivation and meaning of many of the adverbs, conjunctions, and prepositions: and as the student will doubtless be amused, by tracing to their Saxon origin some of these words, we shall present him with a list or specimen of them; which we presume will be sufficient to excite his curiosity, and induce him to examine the subject more extensively.

ABOUT—is derived from *a*, on, and *bout*, signifying boundary: On the boundary or confines.

AMONG or AMONGST—comes from the passive participle *gemænced*, which is from *gemengan*, to mix.

AND—is from the imperative *an-ad*, which is from the verb, *anan-ad*, signifying to accumulate, to add to: as, "Two *and* two are four;" that is, "Two *add* two are four."

ASUNDER—comes from the participle *asundred* of the verb *asundrian* to separate: and this verb is from *Sond*, sand.

ATHWART—is derived from the passive participle *athweoried* of the verb *athweorian*, to wrest.

BEYOND—comes from *be-geond: geond*, or *goned*, is the passive participle of the verb *gangan*, to go, to pass: Be passed, be gone.

BUT—from the imperative *bot*, of the verb *botan*, to boot, to superadd, to supply: as, "The number three is not an even number, *but* an odd; that is, "not an even number, *superadd*, (it is) an odd number."

BUT—from the imperative, *be-utan*, of the verb *beon-utan*, to be out. It is used by way of exception: as, "She regards nobody, *but* him;" that is, "nobody *be out* him."

IF—comes from *gif*, the imperative of the verb *gifan*, to give: as, "If you live honestly, you will live happily;" that is, "*give* you live honestly."

LEST—from the participle, *lesed*, of the verb *lesan*, to dismiss.

THOUGH—from *thafig*, the imperative of the verb *thafigan*, to allow: as, "Though she is handsome, she is not vain:" that is, "*Allow, grant*, she is handsome."

UNLESS—comes from *onles*, the imperative of the verb *onlesan*, to dismiss or remove: as, "Troy will be taken unless the palladium be preserved;" that is, "Remove *the palladium be preserved*, Troy will be taken."

WITH—the imperative of *withan*, to join: as, "A house with a party-wall;" that is, "A house *join* a party-wall."

WITHOUT—comes from *wyrth-utan*, the imperative of the verb *wyrthan-utan*, to be out: as, "A house without a roof;" that is, "A house *be out* a roof."

YET—is derived from *get*, the imperative of the verb *getan*, to get: as, "Yet a little while;" that is, "*Get* a little time."

THROUGH—comes from Gothic and Teutonic words, which signify door, gate, passage: as, "They marched *through* a wilderness;" that is, "They marched the *passage* a wilderness."

FOR—is from Saxon and Gothic words, signifying, cause, motive: as, "He died *for* his religion;" that is, "He died, the *cause* his religion."

FROM—is derived from *frum*, which signifies beginning, origin, source, &c.: as, "The lamp hangs *from* the ceiling;" that is, "Ceiling the place of *beginning* to hang."

TO—comes from Saxon and Gothic words, which signify action, effect, termination, to act, &c.: as, "Figs come *from* Turkey *to* England:" that is, "Figs come—*beginning* Turkey—*Termination* England."

It is highly probable that the system of the acute grammarian, from whose work these Saxon derivations are borrowed, is founded on truth; and that adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions, are corruptions or abbreviations of other parts of speech. But as many of them are derived from obsolete words in our own language, or from words in kindred languages, the radical meaning of which is, therefore, either obscure, or generally unknown; as the system of this very able etymologist is not universally admitted; and as, by long prescription, whatever may have been their origin, the words in question appear to have acquired a title to the rank of distinct species; it seems proper to consider them, as such, in an elementary treatise of grammar: especially as this plan coincides with that, by which other languages must be taught; and will render the study of them less intricate. It is of small moment, by what names and classification we distinguish these words, provided their meaning and use are well understood. A philosophical consideration of the subject, may, with great propriety, be entered upon by the gram-

matical student, when his knowledge and judgment become more improved.

Some critics carry their respect for the Saxon tongue, and their fondness for derivation, to so great an extent, that, if their opinions were adopted and reduced to practice, our language would be disorganized, and many of its rules and principles involved in obscurity. Etymological deductions may certainly be pushed too far, and valued too highly. Like other things they have their proper use and limits, which ought, on no occasion, to be violated. Our Saxon ancestors were governed by their own lights, and by the improvements which they made on the practice of their predecessors. We too must be allowed the privilege of forming our own laws, and adapting them to our wants and convenience. Succeeding generations of men have an indubitable right, to alter the old words of their predecessors, both in point of meaning and orthography, to make new ones, and to class the whole, according to their own views and circumstances. This right, with regard to our own tongue, has been regularly, though very gradually, exercised; and the result has been a great amelioration of the language, in every point of view.

If fanciful, or learned, etymologists are to decide for us, by their remote researches and discoveries, our improvements are at an end. We have nothing to do but to inquire, what was the practice of ancient writers; and to submit to the rude phraseology of authors, who were far inferior to us in science and literature. But during this inquiry, we should be plunged into a state of uncertainty and fluctuation. The various opinions and contests of our Saxon etymologists would perplex and confound us. This, however, would not be our only embarrassment: for, at one time, a derivation from the Saxon must correct present usage: at another, a more recondite examiner would be able to show, that, in the points con-

tested, neither the Saxon, nor present usage, is consistent with the Gothic or Teutonic, from which the Saxon itself was derived. There would, indeed, be no boundary to these remote and obscure derivations; and we should have no decisions upon which we could rest with satisfaction.

Etymology, when it is guided by judgment, and proper limits are set to it, certainly merits great attention: it is then highly conducive to perspicuous and accurate language. But the suggestions of fancy, or the far-fetched discoveries of learning, should not be allowed to supersede the dictates of common sense, sound criticism, and rational improvement. Ancient usage is not the test by which the correctness of modern language is to be tried. The origin of things is certainly a proper and gratifying subject of inquiry; and it is particularly curious and pleasing to trace the words of our language to their remote sources. This pleasure should, however, be confined to speculation. It should not lead us to invert the proper order of things, and to determine the propriety of our present words and forms of expression, by the practice of distant, and comparatively rude ages. On the important subject of the standard of language, we concur entirely with the learned and judicious Dr. Campbell, who, in his "Philosophy of Rhetoric," says, "The standard of language, is reputable, national, and present use."

In confirmation of our views in this discussion, we give the following quotation, from the celebrated Walker, author of the "Critical Pronouncing Dictionary." "As our language (says he) has departed from its Saxon parent, in a thousand instances, I know not why we should encumber it, by preserving Saxon peculiarities, when such improvements as naturally arise in the cultivation of letters, enable us to class words in a clearer and more analogical manner." The sentiments of the Eclectic Reviewers, on the subject in question, are also well worthy of insertion. "What (say they) would have become of the French lan-

guage, if its grammarians and lexicographers had employed their labour and time, in reducing it to the state in which it was left by the Franks, and other barbarous conquerors of ancient Gaul? Yet such appears to us to be the object of several recent treatises on our own language. We are called to reject the refinements, by which our elegant writers of the last century have recommended the English tongue to universal esteem; and to return to the barbarous phraseology of our Saxon ancestors*."

At the same time that we object to the laws, which the antiquarian in language would impose upon us, we must enter our protest against those authors, who are too fond of innovations: and particularly against those ingenious writers on grammar, who wish to alter its long-established terms, and to give many of its parts new definitions, and a new arrangement. These novelties, which we think are so productive of confusion, and so unnecessary, are not likely, in our opinion, to acquire that reputable and general adoption, which is essential to the establishment of literary experiments. On all occasions, they who endeavour to improve our language, should observe a happy medium between too great, and too little, reverence for the usages of ancient times.

In words, as fashions, the same rule will hold,
Alike fantastic, if too new or old:
Be not the first by whom the new are tried,
Nor yet the last to lay the old aside.

Pope's Essay on Criticism.

See the observations on this subject, pages 65, 66, and 105, 106.

---

* Eclectic Review, May, 1808.

Section 2.

A sketch of the steps, by which the English Language has risen to its present state of refinement.

Before we conclude the subject of derivation, it will probably be gratifying to the curious scholar, to be informed of some particulars respecting the origin of the English language, and the various nations to which it is indebted for the copiousness, elegance, and refinement, which it has now attained.

"When the ancient Britons were so harassed and oppressed by the invasions of their northern neighbours, the Scots and Picts, that their situation was truly miserable, they sent an embassy (about the middle of the fifth century) to the Saxons, a warlike people inhabiting the north of Germany, with solicitations for speedy relief. The Saxons accordingly came over to Britain, and were successful in repelling the incursions of the Scots and Picts: but seeing the weak and defenceless state of the Britons, they resolved to take advantage of it; and at length established themselves in the greater part of South-Britain, after having dispossessed the original inhabitants.

From these barbarians, who founded several petty kingdoms in this island, and introduced their own laws, language, and manners, is derived the groundwork of the English language; which, even in its present state of cultivation, and notwithstanding the successive augmentations and improvements, which it has received through various channels, displays very conspicuous traces of its Saxon original.

The Saxons did not long remain in quiet possession of the kingdom; for before the middle of the ninth century, the Danes, a hardy and adventurous nation, who had long infested the northern seas with their piracies,

began to ravage the English coasts. Their first attempts were, in general, attended with such success, that they were encouraged to a renewal of their ravages; till, at length, in the beginning of the eleventh century, they made themselves masters of the greater part of England.

Though the period, during which these invaders occupied the English throne, was very short, not greatly exceeding half a century, it is highly probable that some change was introduced by them into the language spoken by those, whom they had subdued: but this change cannot be supposed to have been very considerable, as the Danish and Saxon languages arose from one common source, the Gothic being the parent of both.

The next conquerors of this kingdom, after the Danes, were the Normans, who, in the year 1066, introduced their leader William to the possession of the English throne. This prince, soon after his accession, endeavoured to bring his own language (the Norman-French) into use among his new subjects; but his efforts were not very successful, as the Saxons entertained a great antipathy to these haughty foreigners. In process of time, however, many Norman words and phrases were incorporated into the Saxon language: but its general form and construction still remained the same.

From the Conquest to the Reformation, the language continued to receive occasional accessions of foreign words, till it acquired such a degree of expression and strength, as to render it susceptible of that polish, which it has received from writers of taste and genius, in the last and present centuries. During this period, the learned have enriched it with many significant expressions, drawn from the treasures of Greek and Roman literature; the ingenious and the fashionable have imported occasional supplies of French, Spanish, Italian, and German words, gleaned during their foreign excursions; and the connexions which we maintain, through the medium

of government and commerce, with many remote nations, have made some additions to our native vocabulary.

In this manner did the ancient language of the Anglo-Saxons proceed, through the various stages of innovation, and the several gradations of refinement, to the formation of the present English tongue.

A language which has been so much indebted to others, both ancient and modern, must of course be very copious and expressive. In these respects, perhaps it may be brought into competition with any now spoken in the world. No Englishman has had reason to complain, since our tongue has reached its present degree of excellence, that his ideas could not be adequately expressed, or clothed in a suitable dress. No author has been under the necessity of writing in a foreign language, on account of its superiority to our own. Whether we open the volumes of our divines, philosophers, historians, or artists, we shall find that they abound with all the terms necessary to communicate their observations and discoveries, and give to their readers the most ample views of their respective subjects. Hence it appears, that our language is sufficient for all topics, and that it can give proper and adequate expression to variety of argument, delicacy of taste, and fervour of genius. That it has sufficient copiousness to communicate to mankind every action, event, invention, and observation, in a full, clear, and elegant manner, may be proved by an appeal to the authors, who are at present held in the greatest esteem."

CHAPTER XII.

NUMBER AND VARIETY OF WORDS—THEIR EXTENSIVE SIGNIFICATION—ARBITRARY SIGNS OF IDEAS.

"THOUGH the number of elementary sounds is not great in any language, the variety of *possible* words, that may be formed by combining them, is, in every tongue, so great, as almost to exceed computation, and much more than sufficient to express all the varieties of human thought. But the *real* words, even of the most copious language, may without difficulty be numbered; for a good dictionary comprehends them all, or nearly the whole of them. In the English tongue, after deducting proper names, and the inflections of our verbs and nouns, they do not exceed forty thousand.

We must not, however, estimate the number of our ideas, by that of our words; the former being beyond comparison more numerous and diversified than the latter. Many thoughts we express, not by particular terms appropriated to each, but by a periphrasis, or combination of terms, which, under different forms of arrangement and connexion, may be applied to a great variety of different purposes; and many thoughts are communicated in tropes and figures; and many may sometimes be signified by one and the same word. There are few terms in language, that have not more than one meaning; some have several, and some a great number. In how many different ways, and to how many different purposes, may the verbs *do*, *lie*, *lay*, and *take*, for example, be applied! Johnson's Dictionary will show this, and much more of the same kind; and leave the reader equally astonished at the acuteness of the lexicographer, and at the complex nature

and use of certain minute parts of human speech. Even of our prepositions, one has upwards of twelve, one more than twenty, and one not fewer than thirty different meanings. And yet, when we understand a language, we are not sensible of any perplexity arising from these circumstances: all ambiguities of sense, being, in a correct style, prevented by a right arrangement of the words, and other artifices of composition.

Words derive their meaning from the consent and practice of those who use them. There is no necessary connexion between words and ideas. The association between the sign and the thing signified, is purely arbitrary. If we were to contrive a new language, we might make any articulate sound the sign of any idea: there would be no impropriety in calling oxen *men*, or rational beings by the name of *oxen*. But where a language is already formed, they who speak it must use words in the customary sense. By doing otherwise, they incur the charge, either of affectation, if they mean only to be remarkable, or of falsehood, if they mean to deceive. To speak as others speak, is one of those tacit obligations, annexed to the condition of living in society, which we are bound in conscience to fulfil, though we have never ratified them by any express promise; because, if they were disregarded, society would be impossible, and human happiness at an end. It is true, that, in a book of science founded on definition, words may be used in any sense, provided their meaning be explained. In this case there is no falsehood, because there is no intention to deceive. But, even in this case, if the common analogies of language were violated, the author would be justly blamed, for giving unnecessary trouble to his readers, and for endeavouring capriciously to abrogate a custom, which universal use had rendered more respectable, as well as more convenient, than any other, which he could substitute in its room."

This proper respect for the customary sense of words, does not, however, preclude improvements in language. We are not bound to adhere for ever to the terms, or to the meaning of terms, which were established by our ancestors. But our alterations should be proposed with great caution and modesty. Too much should not be offered at once: the deviations from general usage should be gradual as well as temperate. By these means, the public taste and judgment are consulted; our habits and feelings are not shocked; and the proposed variations, if approved, are introduced and established almost imperceptibly.

PART III.

SYNTAX.

THE third part of grammar is SYNTAX, which treats of the agreement and construction of words in a sentence.

A sentence is an assemblage of words, forming a complete sense.

Sentences are of two kinds, simple and compound.

A simple sentence has in it but one subject, and one finite* verb: as, "Life is short."

A compound sentence consists of two or more simple sentences, connected together: as, "Life is short, and art is long." "Idleness produces want, vice, and misery."

As sentences themselves are divided into simple and compound, so the members of sentences may be divided likewise into simple and compound members: for whole sentences, whether simple or compounded, may become members of other sentences, by means of some additional connexion: as in the following example: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people do not consider." This sentence consists of two compounded members, each of which is subdivided into two simple members, which are properly called clauses.

---

* Finite verbs are those to which number and person appertain. Verbs in the infinitive mood have no respect to number or person.

PART III.

SYNTAX.

THE third part of grammar is SYNTAX, which treats of the agreement and construction of words in a sentence.

A sentence is an assemblage of words, forming a complete sense.

Sentences are of two kinds, simple and compound.

A simple sentence has in it but one subject, and one finite* verb: as, "Life is short."

A compound sentence consists of two or more simple sentences, connected together: as, "Life is short, and art is long." "Idleness produces want, vice, and misery."

As sentences themselves are divided into simple and compound, so the members of sentences may be divided likewise into simple and compound members: for whole sentences, whether simple or compounded, may become members of other sentences, by means of some additional connexion; as in the following example: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people do not consider." This sentence consists of two compounded members, each of which is subdivided into two simple members, which are properly called clauses.

---

* *Finite* verbs are those to which number and person appertain. Verbs in the *infinitive* mood have no respect to number or person.

There are three sorts of simple sentences; the *explicative*, or explaining; the *interrogative*, or asking; the *imperative*, or commanding.

An explicative sentence is, when a thing is said to be or not to be, to do or not to do, to suffer or not to suffer, in a direct manner: as, "I am; thou writest; Thomas is loved." If the sentence be negative, the adverb *not* is placed after the auxiliary, or after the verb itself when it has no auxiliary: as, "I did not touch him;" or, "I touched him not."

In an interrogative sentence, or when a question is asked, the nominative case follows the principal verb, or the auxiliary: as, "Was it he?" "Did Alexander conquer the Persians?"

In an imperative sentence, when a thing is commanded to be, to do, to suffer, or not, the nominative case likewise follows the verb or the auxiliary: as, "Go, thou traitor!" "Do thou go:" "Haste ye away:" unless the verb *let* be used; as, "Let us be gone."

A phrase is two or more words rightly put together, making sometimes part of a sentence, and sometimes a whole sentence.

The principal parts of a simple sentence are, the subject, the attribute, and the object.

The subject is the thing chiefly spoken of; the attribute is the thing or action affirmed or denied of it; and the object is the thing affected by such action.

The nominative denotes the subject, and usually goes before the verb or attribute; and the word or phrase, denoting the object, follows the verb: as, "A wise man governs his passions." Here, *a wise man* is the subject; *governs*, the attribute, or thing affirmed; and *his passions*, the object.

Syntax principally consists of two parts, *Concord* and *Government*.

Concord is the agreement which one word has with another, in gender, number, case, or person.

Government is that power which one part of speech has over another, in directing its mood, tense, or case.

In arranging the Rules of Syntax, we have adopted that scheme which appeared to be the least liable to objections; and the most likely to impress the mind of the learner, and be retained in his memory. The plan corresponds very nearly with that, which is founded on the Concord and Government of words. But an arrangement on this principle is not, in all cases, sufficiently distinct; and, if it were strictly adhered to, would not embrace all the rules of Syntax. The rule, that "a verb must agree with its nominative, in number and person," being of primary use and importance, demands the first place. The seven subsequent rules are so intimately connected with the principle of the first rule, that they necessarily follow it, without admitting the intervention of any other. By this arrangement, the pronouns are presented in a distinct point of view, and in regular succession. The English adjective, having but a very limited syntax, is classed with its kindred article, the adjective pronoun, under the eighth rule. It has, however, an appropriate section under that rule. After this special disposition, the syntax of the remaining parts of speech, is exhibited according to their etymological arrangement. The whole is closed by two rules of a mixed and general nature.—By this order, the first nine rules accord with those which respect the rules of Concord; and the remainder include, though they extend beyond, the rules of Government.

To produce the agreement and right disposition of words in a sentence, the following rules and observations should be carefully studied.

RULE I.

A VERB must agree with its nominative case, in number and person: as, "I learn;" "Thou art improved;" "The birds sing."

See vol. ii. p. 77.

THE following are a few instances of the violation of this rule. "What signifies good opinions, when our practice is bad?" "what *signify*." "There's two or three of us, who have seen the work:" "there *are*." "We may suppose there was more imposters than one:" "there *were* more." "I have considered what have been said on both sides in this controversy:" "what *has* been said." "If thou would be healthy, live temperately:" "if thou *wouldst*." "Thou sees how little has been done:" "thou *seest*." "Though thou cannot do much for the cause, thou may and should do something:" "*canst not*, *mayst*, and *shouldst*." "Full many a flower are born to blush unseen:" "*is* born." "A conformity of inclinations and qualities prepare us for friendship:" "*prepares* us." "A variety of blessings have been conferred upon us:" "*has* been." "In piety and virtue consist the happiness of man:" "*consists*." "To these precepts are subjoined a copious selection of rules and maxims:" "*is* subjoined."

*1. The infinitive mood, or part of a sentence, is sometimes put as the nominative case to the verb: as,

* The chief practical notes under each Rule, are regularly numbered, that they may correspond with the examples in the volume of Exercises.

"To see the sun *is* pleasant;" "To be good *is* to be happy;" "A desire to excel others in learning and virtue *is* commendable;" "That warm climates should accelerate the growth of the human body, and shorten its duration, *is* very reasonable to believe;" "Promising without due consideration, often *produces* a breach of promise;" "To be temperate in eating and drinking, to use exercise in the open air, and to preserve the mind free from tumultuous emotions, *are* the best preservatives of health." These sentences, or clauses, thus constituting the subject of an affirmation, may be termed *nominative sentences.*

2. Every verb, except in the infinitive mood, or the participle, ought to have a nominative case, either expressed or implied: as, "Awake; arise;" that is, "Awake ye; arise ye."

We shall here add some examples of inaccuracy, in the use of the verb without its nominative case. "As it hath pleased him of his goodness to give you safe deliverance, and hath preserved you in the great danger," &c. The verb "*hath preserved*," has here no nominative case; for it cannot be properly supplied by the preceding word, "*him*," which is in the objective case. It ought to be, "and as *he hath preserved* you;" or rather, "and *to preserve* you." "If the calm in which he was born, and lasted so long, had continued;" "and *which* lasted," &c. "These we have extracted from an historian of undoubted credit, and are the same that were practised," &c.: "and *they are* the same." "A man whose inclinations led him to be corrupt, and had great abilities to manage the business;" "and *who* had," &c. "A cloud gathering in the north; which we have helped to raise, and may quickly break in a storm upon our heads;" "and *which* may quickly."

3. Every nominative case, except the case absolute, and when an address is made to a person, should belong to some verb, either expressed or implied: as, "Who wrote this book?" "James;" that is, "James wrote it." "To whom thus Adam," that is, "spoke." "Who invented the telescope?" "Galileo;" that is, "Galileo invented the telescope."

One or two instances of the improper use of the nominative case, without any verb, expressed or implied, to answer it, may be sufficient to illustrate the usefulness of the preceding observation.

"*Which rule,* if it had been observed, a neighbouring prince would have wanted a great deal of that incense, which hath been offered up to him." The pronoun *it* is here the nominative case to the verb "observed;" and *which rule,* is left by itself, a nominative case without any verb following it. This form of expression, though improper, is very common. It ought to be, "*If this rule* had been observed," &c. "*Man,* though he has great variety of thoughts, and such from which others as well as himself might receive profit and delight, yet they are all within his own breast." In this sentence, the nominative *man* stands alone and unconnected with any verb, either expressed or implied. It should be, "*Though man* has great variety," &c.

4. When a verb comes between two nouns, either of which may be understood as the subject of the affirmation, it may agree with either of them; but some regard must be had to that which is more naturally the subject of it, as also to that which stands next to the verb: as, "His meat *was* locusts and wild honey;" "A great cause of the low state of industry *were* the restraints put upon it;" "The wages of sin *is* death."

In such sentences as those which follow, either of the clauses may be considered as the nominative to the verb. "To show how the understanding proceeds herein, *is* the design of the following discourse." This sentence may be inverted without changing a single word: "The design of the following discourse *is*, to show how the understanding proceeds herein." "To fear no eye, and to suspect no tongue, *is* the great prerogative of innocence." This sentence may be inverted: but, according to the English idiom, the pronoun *it* would, in that case, precede the verb: as, "*It* is the great prerogative of innocence, to fear no eye, and to suspect no tongue."

5. When the nominative case has no personal tense of a verb, but is put before a participle, independently on the rest of the sentence, it is called the case absolute: as, "Shame being lost, all virtue is lost;" "That having been discussed long ago, there is no occasion to resume it."

As in the use of the case absolute, the case is, in English, always the nominative, the following example is erroneous, in making it the objective. "Solomon was of this mind; and I have no doubt he made as wise and true proverbs, as any body has done since; *him* only excepted, who was a much greater and wiser man than Solomon." It should be, "*he* only excepted."

The nominative case is commonly placed before the verb; but sometimes it is put after the verb, if it is a simple tense; and between the auxiliary, and the verb or participle, if a compound tense: as,

1st, When a question is asked, a command given, or a wish expressed: as, "Confidest thou in me?" "Read thou;" "Mayst thou be happy!" "Long live the King!"

2d, When a supposition is made, without the conjunction *if:* as, "Were it not for this;" Had I been there."

3d, When a verb neuter is used: as, "On a sudden appeared the king." "Above it stood the seraphim."

4th, When the verb is preceded by the adverbs, *here, there, then, thence, hence, thus,* &c.: as, "Here am I;" "There was he slain;" "Then cometh the end;" "Thence ariseth his grief;" "Hence proceeds his anger;" "Thus was the affair settled."

5th, When a sentence depends on *neither* or *nor,* so as to be coupled with another sentence: as, "Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die."

6th, When an emphatical adjective introduces a sentence: as, "Happy is the man, whose heart does not reproach him."

Grammarians differ in opinion, respecting the propriety of the following modes of expression: "The arguments advanced were nearly *as follows;*" "The positions were, *as appears,* incontrovertible."—Some maintain that the phrases *as follows, as appears,* form what are called impersonal verbs; and should, therefore, be confined to the singular number: the construction being, "as it follows," "as it appears." They assert, that if we give the sentence a different turn, and instead of *as,* say *such as,* the verb is no longer termed impersonal; but properly agrees with its nominative, in the plural number: as, "The arguments advanced were nearly *such as follow;*" "The positions were *such as appear* incontrovertible." Of this opinion is the learned Dr. Campbell, who, in his "Philosophy of Rhetoric," says, "When a verb is used impersonally, it ought undoubtedly to be in the singular number, whether the neuter pronoun be expressed or understood. For this reason, analogy and usage favour this mode of expression: 'The conditions of the agreement were *as follows,*' and not, *as follow.* A few late writers have inconsiderately

adopted the last form, through a mistake of the construction. For the same reason, we ought to say, 'I shall consider his censures so far only, *as concerns* my friend's conduct;' and not, 'so far *as concern*.'"

Other writers contend, that the word *as* is equivalent to *it*, *that*, or *which*; and that *as*, in the phrases mentioned, is the true nominative to the verbs *follows* and *appears*; which should consequently be written, *as follow*, *as appear*. They assert, that *as* is used either in the singular or the plural number: in the singular: as, "His insensibility is such *as excites* our detestation:" in the plural thus: "His manners are such, *as are* universally pleasing." That, in the former example, *such as is* equivalent to *that which*, and in the latter to *those which*. That if *as* be either singular or plural, and synonymous with *it*, *that*, or *which*, it must, when it refers to a plural antecedent, like *which*, be considered as plural, and joined to a plural verb. That it is more consonant with analogy to say; "The circumstances were, which follow," than *it follows*, or *that follows*. They further observe, that when the demonstrative *such* precedes, and is joined to a plural noun, it is universally admitted, that *as* must then be followed by a plural verb: if so, the construction of the word *as* cannot be, in the least degree, affected by the ellipsis of the correlative term.

The diversity of sentiment on this subject, and the respectability of the different opponents, will naturally induce the readers to pause and reflect, before they decide. They who doubt the accuracy of Horne Tooke's statement, "That *as*, however and whenever used in English, means the same as *it*, or *that*, or *which*;" and who are not satisfied whether the verbs, in the sentences first mentioned, should be in the singular or the plural number, may vary the form of expression. Thus, the meaning of the sentences alluded to, may be conveyed in the following terms, or in other equivalent expressions. "The arguments advanced were nearly such as follow;" "The arguments advanced

were nearly of the following nature;" "The following are nearly the arguments which were advanced;" "The arguments advanced were nearly those which follow;" "These, or nearly these, were the arguments advanced:" "The positions were such as appear incontrovertible;" "It appears that the positions were incontrovertible;" "That the positions were incontrovertible, is apparent;" "The positions were apparently incontrovertible;" "In appearance, the positions were incontrovertible."

It has been advanced as a rule of grammar, that "When the nominative consists of several words, and the last of the nouns is in the plural number, the verb is commonly plural:" as, "A part of the exports *consist* of raw silk;" "A number of men and women *were* present;" "The train of our ideas *are* often interrupted." The support of this rule has been ingeniously attempted, by the following observations: "The whole of the words, in the first part of each of the preceding sentences, or the noun and its adjuncts, are the actual nominative. Separate the words *part* and *exports*, in the first example, and the affirmation of the verb cannot with truth be applied to either: and as the whole must be considered as the nominative, the verb is very naturally connected in number with the last noun." —This reasoning, how plausible soever it may, at first sight, appear, is certainly destitute of solidity. It would counteract some of the plainest principles of grammar; and would justify the following constructions, and a multitude of others of a similar nature. "The truth of the narratives *have* never been disputed;" "The virtue of these men and women, *are* indeed exemplary:" "A fondness for such distinctions, *render* a man ridiculous;" "A deviation from good principles, soon *produce* a deviation from good conduct." In each of these instances, it may be said, as our opponents say in support of the proposed rule, that if we separate the two nouns, the affirmation

cannot with truth be applied to either: the verb respects the whole preceding phrase, in the one case as much as in the other. But will it hence follow, that the verb is to be connected in number with the last noun? The truth is, the assertion grammatically respects the first nouns in all the preceding instances. The adjuncts are connected with those nouns, as subordinate parts, or as modifications, and are put in the *objective* case, governed by the prepositions. The latter nouns cannot therefore be the nominatives to the respective verbs; they cannot be, at the same time, in the nominative and objective cases. That a sentence, or part of a sentence, may be the nominative to a verb, is undoubtedly true: but, in these cases, the construction is obviously different from that which exists in the cases enumerated under the proposed rule. In the former, there is no prominent object to which the verb chiefly relates; and the whole preceding part must therefore be considered as the nominative: in the latter, there is a capital, leading object, which attracts the verb, and which supports the dependent circumstances.

RULE II.

Two or more nouns, &c. in the singular number, joined together by a copulative conjunction, expressed or understood, must have verbs, nouns, and pronouns, agreeing with them in the plural number: as, "Socrates and Plato *were* wise; *they* were the most eminent philosophers of Greece;" "The sun that rolls over our heads, the food that we receive, the rest that we enjoy, daily *admonish* us of a superior and super-intending Power*."

See vol. ii. p. 82.

* For the exceptions to this rule, see vol. ii. p. 322. The note.

This rule is often violated; some instances of which are annexed. "And so was also James and John, the sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon;" "and so *were* also." "All joy, tranquillity, and peace, even for ever and ever, doth dwell;" "*dwell* for ever." "By whose power all good and evil is distributed;" "*are* distributed." "Their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished;" "*are* perished." "The thoughtless and intemperate enjoyment of pleasure, the criminal abuse of it, and the forgetfulness of our being accountable creatures, obliterates every serious thought of the proper business of life, and effaces the sense of religion and of God." It out to be, "*obliterate*," and "*efface*."

1. When the nouns are nearly related, or scarcely distinguishable in sense, and sometimes even when they are very different, some authors have thought it allowable to put the verbs, nouns, and pronouns, in the singular number: as, "Tranquillity and peace dwells there;" "Ignorance and negligence has produced the effect;" "The discomfiture and slaughter was very great." But it is evidently contrary to the first principles of grammar, to consider two distinct ideas as one, however nice may be their shades of difference: and if there be no difference, one of them must be superfluous, and ought to be rejected.

To support the above construction, it is said, that the verb may be understood as applied to each of the preceding terms; as in the following example: "Sand, and salt, and a mass of iron, *is* easier to bear than a man without understanding." But besides the confusion, and the latitude of application, which such a construction would introduce, it appears to be more proper and analogical, in cases where the verb is intended to be applied to any one of the terms, to make use of the disjunctive conjunction, which grammatically refers the verb to one or other of the preceding

terms in a separate view. To preserve the distinctive uses of the copulative and disjunctive conjunctions, would render the rules precise, consistent, and intelligible. Dr. Blair observes, that "two or more substantives, joined by a copulative, must *always* require the verb or pronoun to which they refer, to be placed in the plural number:" and this is the general sentiment of English grammarians.

2. In many complex sentences, it is difficult for learners to determine, whether one or more of the clauses are to be considered as the nominative case; and consequently, whether the verb should be in the singular or the plural number. We shall, therefore, set down a number of varied examples of this nature, which may serve as some government to the scholar, with respect to sentences of a similar construction. "Prosperity, with humility, *renders* its possessor truly amiable." "The ship, with all her furniture, *was* destroyed." "Not only his estate, his reputation too *has* suffered by his misconduct." "The general also, in conjunction with the officers, *has* applied for redress." "He cannot be justified; for it is true, that the prince, as well as the people, *was* blameworthy." "The king, with his life-guard, *has* just passed through the village." "In the mutual influence of body and soul, there *is* a wisdom, a wonderful wisdom, which we cannot fathom." "Virtue, honour, nay, even self-interest, *conspire* to recommend the measure." "Patriotism, morality, every public and private consideration, *demand* our submission to just and lawful government." "Nothing *delights* me so much as the works of nature."—*See the 2nd vol. p. 43 to 52.*

In support of such forms of expression as the following, we see the authority of Hume, Priestley, and other writers; and we annex them for the reader's consideration. "A long course of time, with a variety of accidents and circumstances, *are* requisite to produce those revolutions." "The king, with the lords and commons, *form* an excel-

lent frame of government." "The side A, with the sides B and C, *compose* the triangle." "The fire communicated itself to the bed, which, with the furniture of the room, and a valuable library, *were* all entirely consumed." It is, however, proper to observe, that these modes of expression do not appear to be warranted by the just principles of construction. The words, "A long course of time," "The king," "The side A," and "which," are the true nominatives to the respective verbs. In the last example, the word *all* should be expunged. As the preposition *with* governs the *objective* case, in English; and, if translated into Latin, would govern the *ablative* case, it is manifest, that the clauses following *with*, in the preceding sentences, cannot form any part of the *nominative* case. They cannot be at the same time in the objective and the nominative cases. The following sentence appears to be unexceptionable; and may serve to explain the others. "The lords and commons are essential branches of the British constitution: the king, with them, *forms* an excellent frame of government*."

3. If the singular nouns and pronouns, which are joined together by a copulative conjunction, be of several persons, in making the plural pronoun agree with them in person, the second person takes place of the third, and the first of both: as, "James, and thou, and I, *are* attached to *our* country." "Thou and he shared it between *you*."

* Though the construction will not admit of a plural verb, the sentence would certainly stand better thus: "The king, the lords, and the commons, *form* an excellent constitution."

RULE III.

The conjunction disjunctive has an effect contrary to that of the conjunction copulative; for as the verb, noun, or pronoun, is referred to the preceding terms taken separately, it must be in the singular number: as, "Ignorance or negligence *has* caused this mistake; "John, James, or Joseph, *intends* to accompany me;" "There *is*, in many minds, neither knowledge nor understanding."

See vol. ii. p. 85.

The following sentences are variations from this rule. "A man may see a metaphor or an allegory in a picture, as well as read them in a description;" "read *it*." "Neither character nor dialogue were yet understood;" "*was* yet." "It must indeed be confessed, that a lampoon or a satire, do not carry in them robbery or murder;" "*does* not carry in *it*." "Death, or some worse misfortune, soon divide them." It ought to be "*divides*."

1. When singular pronouns, or a noun and pronoun, of different persons, are disjunctively connected, the verb must agree with that person which is placed nearest to it: as, "I or thou *art* to blame;" "Thou or I *am* in fault;" "I, or thou, or he, *is* the author of it;" "George or I *am* the person." But it would be better to say; "Either I am to blame, or thou art," &c.

2. When a disjunctive occurs between a singular noun, or pronoun, and a plural one, the verb is made to agree with the plural noun and pronoun: as, "Neither poverty nor riches *were* injurious to him;" "I or they *were* offended by it." But in this case, the plural noun or pronoun, when it can conveniently be done, should be placed next to the verb.

RULE IV.

A NOUN of multitude, or signifying many, may have a verb or pronoun agreeing with it, either of the singular or plural number; yet not without regard to the import of the word, as conveying unity or plurality of idea: as, "The meeting *was* large;" "The parliament *is* dissolved;" "The nation *is* powerful;" "My people *do* not consider: *they* have not known me;" "The multitude eagerly *pursue* pleasure, as *their* chief good;" "The council *were* divided in *their* sentiments."

See vol. ii. p. 86.

WE ought to consider whether the term immediately suggests the idea of the number it represents, or whether it exhibits to the mind the idea of the whole as one thing. In the former case, the verb ought to be plural; in the latter, it ought to be singular. Thus, it seems improper to say, "The peasantry *goes* barefoot, and the middle sort *makes* use of wooden shoes." It would be better to say, "The peasantry *go* barefoot, and the middle sort *make* use," &c.; because the idea in both these cases, is that of a number. On the contrary, there is a harshness in the following sentences, in which nouns of number have verbs plural; because the ideas they represent seem not to be sufficiently divided in the mind. "The court of Rome *were* not without solicitude." "The house of commons *were* of small weight." "The house of lords *were* so much influenced by these reasons." "Stephen's party *were* entirely broken up by the captivity of their leader." "An army of twenty-four thousand *were* assembled." "What reason *have* the church of Rome for proceeding in this manner?" "There is in-

deed no constitution so tame and careless of *their* own defence." "All the virtues of mankind are to be counted upon a few fingers, but *his* follies and vices are innumerable." Is not *mankind* in this place a noun of multitude, and such as requires the pronoun referring to it, to be in the plural number, *their?*

When a noun of multitude is preceded by a definitive word, which clearly limits the sense to an aggregate with an idea of unity, it requires a verb and pronoun to agree with it in the singular number: as, "*A* company of troops *was* detached; *a* troop of cavalry *was* raised; *this* people *is* become a great nation; *that* assembly *was* numerous; a great number of men and women *was* collected."—*See page* 224.

On many occasions, where a noun of multitude is used, it is very difficult to decide, whether the verb should be in the singular, or in the plural number: and this difficulty has induced some grammarians to cut the knot at once, and to assert that every noun of multitude, as it constitutes *one* aggregate of many particulars, must always be considered as conveying the idea of *unity;* and that, consequently, the verb and pronoun agreeing with it, cannot, with propriety, be ever used in the plural number. This opinion appears to be not well considered; it is contrary to the established practice of the best writers of the language, and against the rules of the most respectable grammarians. Some nouns of multitude certainly convey to the mind an idea of plurality, others, that of a whole as one thing, and others again, sometimes that of unity, and sometimes that of plurality. On this ground, it is warrantable, and consistent with the nature of things, to apply a plural verb and pronoun to the one class, and a singular verb and pronoun, to the other. We shall immediately perceive the impropriety of the following constructions: "The clergy *has* withdrawn *itself* from the temporal courts;" "The nobility, exclusive of *its*

capacity as hereditary *counsellor* of the crown, *forms* the *pillar* to support the throne;" "The commonalty *is* divided into several degrees;" "The people of England *is* possessed of super-eminent privileges;" "The multitude *was* clamorous for the object of *its* affections;" "The assembly *was* divided in *its opinion*;" "The fleet *was* all dispersed, and some of *it was* taken."—In all these instances, as well as in many others, the plural verb and pronoun should be used: and if the reader will apply them, as he looks over the sentences a second time, he will perceive the propriety and effect of a change in the construction.

RULE V.

PRONOUNS must always agree with their antecedents, and the nouns for which they stand, in gender and number: as, "This is the friend *whom* I love;" "That is the vice *which* I hate;" "The king and the queen had put on *their* robes;" "The moon appears, and *she* shines, but the light is not *her* own."

The relative is of the same person as the antecedent, and the verb agrees with it accordingly: as, "Thou *who lovest* wisdom;" "I *who speak* from experience."

See vol. ii. p. 88.

OF this rule there are many violations to be met with; a few of which may be sufficient to put the learner on his guard. "*Each* of the sexes should keep within *its* particular bounds, and content *themselves* with the advantages of *their* particular districts:" better thus: "The sexes should keep within *their* particular bounds," &c. "Can any one, on their entrance into the world, be fully secure that they shall not be deceived?" "on *his* entrance," and

"that *he* shall." "One should not think too favourably of ourselves;" "of *one's self.*" "He had one acquaintance which poisoned his principles;" "*who* poisoned."

Every relative must have an antecedent to which it refers, either expressed or implied: as, "Who is fatal to others, is so to himself;" that is, "*the man who* is fatal to others."

Who, which, what, and the relative *that,* though in the objective case, are always placed before the verb; as are also their compounds, *whoever, whosoever,* &c.: as, "He whom ye seek;" "This is what, or the thing which, or that, you want;" "Whomsoever you please to appoint."

What is sometimes applied, in a manner which appears to be exceptionable: as, "All fevers, except what are called nervous," &c. It would at least be better to say, "except *those which* are called nervous."

What is very frequently used as the representative of two cases; one the objective after a verb or preposition, and the other, the nominative to a subsequent verb: as, "I heard *what* was said." "He related *what* was seen." "According to *what* was proposed." "We do not constantly love *what* has done us good."—This peculiar construction may be explained, by resolving *what* into its principles *that which:* as, "I heard *that which* was said:" &c.

In a few instances, the relative is introduced as the nominative to a verb, *before* the sentence or clause which it represents: as, "There was therefore, *which* is all that we assert, a course of life pursued by them, different from that which they before led." Here, the relative *which* is the representative of the whole of the last part of the sentence; and its natural position is *after* that clause.

Whatever relative is used, in one of a series of clauses, relating to the same antecedent, the same relative ought generally to be used in them all. In the following sentence, this rule is violated: "It is remarkable, that Hol-

land, against *which* the war was undertaken, and *that*, in the very beginning, was reduced to the brink of destruction, lost nothing." The clause ought to have been, "and *which* in the very beginning."

The relative frequently refers to a whole clause in the sentence, instead of a particular word in it: as, "The resolution was adopted hastily, and without due consideration, which produced great dissatisfaction;" that is, "which thing," namely, the hasty adoption of the resolution.

1. Personal pronouns being used to supply the place of the noun, are not employed in the same part of a sentence as the noun which they represent; for it would be improper to say, "The king *he* is just;" "I saw *her* the queen;" "The men *they* were there;" "Many words *they* darken speech;" "My banks *they* are furnished with bees." These personals are superfluous, as there is very seldom any occasion for a substitute in the same part where the principal word is present. The nominative case *they*, in the following sentence, is also superfluous: "Who, instead of going about doing good, *they* are perpetually intent upon doing mischief."

This rule is often infringed, by the case absolute's not being properly distinguished from certain forms of expression apparently similar to it. In this sentence, "The candidate being chosen, the people carried him in triumph," the word *candidate* is in the absolute case. But in the following sentence, "The candidate, being chosen, was carried in triumph by the people," *candidate* is the nominative to the verb *was carried;* and therefore it is not in the case absolute. Many writers, however, apprehending the nominative in this latter sentence, as well as in the former, to be put absolutely, often insert another nominative to the verb, and say, "The candidate being chosen, *he* was carried in triumph by the people;" "The general approving the plan, *he* put it in execution." The

error in each of these two sentences, is, that there are two nominatives used, where one would have been sufficient, and consequently that *he* is redundant.

2. The pronoun *that* is frequently applied to persons as well as to things; but after an adjective in the superlative degree, and after the pronominal adjective *same*, it is generally used in preference to *who* or *which*: as, "Charles XII. king of Sweden, was one of the greatest madmen *that* the world ever saw;" "Cataline's followers were the most profligate *that* could be found in any city." "He is the same man *that* we saw before." But if, after the word *same* a preposition should precede the relative, one of the other two pronouns must be employed, the pronoun *that* not admitting a preposition prefixed to it: as, "He is the same man, *with whom* you were acquainted." It is remarkable, however, that, when the arrangement is a little varied, the word *that* admits the preposition: as, "He is the same man, *that* you were acquainted *with*."

There are cases wherein we cannot conveniently dispense with the relative *that*, as applied to persons: as first, after *who* the interrogative; "Who *that* has any sense of religion, would have argued thus?" Secondly, when persons make but a part of the antecedent; "The woman, and the estate, *that* became his portion, were rewards far beyond his desert." In neither of these examples could any other relative have been used.

3. The pronouns *whichsoever*, *whosoever*, and the like, are elegantly divided by the interposition of the corresponding substantives: thus, "On whichsoever side the king cast his eyes;" would have sounded better, if written, "On which side soever," &c.

4. Many persons are apt, in conversation, to put the objective case of the personal pronouns, in the place of

these and *those*: as, "Give me them books;" instead of "*those* books." We may sometimes find this fault even in writing: as, "Observe *them* three there." We also frequently meet with *those* instead of *they*, at the beginning of a sentence, and where there is no particular reference to an antecedent: as, "*Those* that sow in tears, sometimes reap in joy." *They* that, or *they* who sow in tears.

It is not, however, always easy to say, whether a personal pronoun or a demonstrative is preferable, in certain constructions. "We are not unacquainted with the calumny of *them* [or those] who openly make use of the warmest professions."

5. In some dialects, the word *what* is improperly used for *that*, and sometimes we find it in this sense in writing: "They will never believe but *what* I have been entirely to blame." "I am not satisfied but what," &c. instead of "but *that*." The word *somewhat*, in the following sentence, seems to be used improperly. "These punishments seem to have been exercised in somewhat an arbitrary manner." Sometimes we read, "In somewhat of." The meaning is, "in a manner which is in some respects arbitrary."

6. The pronoun relative *who* is so much appropriated to persons, that there is generally harshness in the application of it, except to the proper names of persons, or the general terms *man*, *woman*, &c. A term which only implies the idea of persons, and expresses them by some circumstance or epithet, will hardly authorize the use of it: as, "That faction in England, *who* most powerfully opposed his arbitrary pretensions." "That faction *which*," would have been better; and the same remark will serve for the following examples: "France, *who* was in alliance with Sweden." "The court, *who*," &c. "The cavalry *who*," &c. "The cities *who* aspired at liberty." "That party among

us *who*," &c. "The family *whom* they consider as usurpers."

In some cases it may be doubtful, whether this pronoun is properly applied or not: as, "The number of substantial inhabitants with *whom* some cities abound." For when a term directly and necessarily implies persons, it may in many cases claim the personal relative. "None of the company *whom* he most affected, could cure him of the melancholy under which he laboured." The word *acquaintance* may have the same construction.

7. We hardly consider little children as persons, because that term gives us the idea of reason and reflection: and therefore the application of the personal relative *who*, in this case, seems to be harsh: "A child *who*." *It*, though neuter, is generally applied, when we speak of an infant or child: as, "*It* is a lovely infant;" "*It* is a healthy child." The personal pronoun is still more improperly applied to animals: "A lake frequented by that fowl, *whom* nature has taught to dip the wing in water."

8. When the name of a person is used merely as a name, and it does not refer to the person, the pronoun *who* ought not to be applied. "It is no wonder if such a man did not shine at the court of queen Elizabeth, *who* was but another name for prudence and economy." Better thus; "Whose name was but another word for prudence," &c. The word *whose* begins likewise to be restricted to persons; yet it is not done so generally, but that good writers, even in prose, use it when speaking of things. The construction is not, however, always pleasing, as we may see in the following instances: "Pleasure, *whose* nature," &c. "Call every production, *whose* parts and *whose* nature," &c.

In one case, however, custom authorizes us to use *which* with respect to persons; and that is when we want to distinguish one person of two, or a particular person among

a number of others. We should then say, "*Which* of the two," or "*Which* of them, is he or she?"

9. As the pronoun relative has no distinction of number, we sometimes find an ambiguity in the use of it: as, when we say, "The disciples of Christ, *whom* we imitate;" we may mean the imitation either of Christ, or of his disciples. The accuracy and clearness of the sentence, depend very much upon the proper and determinate use of the relative, so that it may readily present its antecedent to the mind of the hearer or reader, without any obscurity or ambiguity.

10. *It is* and *it was*, are often, after the manner of the French, used in a plural construction, and by some of our best writers: as, "*It is* either a few great men who decide for the whole, or *it is* the rabble that follow a seditious ringleader;" "*It is* they that are the real authors, though the soldiers are the actors of the revolutions;" "*It was* the heretics that first began to rail," &c.; "'*Tis these* that early taint the female mind." This license in the construction of *it is*, (if it be proper to admit it at all,) has, however, been certainly abused in the following sentence, which is thereby made a very awkward one. "*It is* wonderful the very few accidents, which, in several years, happen from this practice."

11. The interjections *O! Oh!* and *Ah!* require the objective case of a pronoun in the first person after them: as, "O me! Oh me! Ah me!" But the nominative case in the second person: as, "O thou persecutor!" "Oh ye hypocrites!" "O thou, who dwellest," &c.

The neuter pronoun, by an idiom peculiar to the English language, is frequently joined in explanatory sentences, with a noun or pronoun of the masculine or feminine gen-

der: as, "It was I;" "It was the man or woman that did it."

The neuter pronoun *it* is sometimes omitted and understood; thus we say, "As appears, as follows;" for "As it appears, as it follows;" and "May be," for "It may be."

The neuter pronoun *it* is sometimes employed to express;

1st, The subject of any discourse or inquiry: as, "*It* happened on a summer's day;" "Who is *it* that calls on me?"

2d, The state or condition of any person or thing: as, "How is *it* with you?"

3d, The thing, whatever it be, that is the cause of any effect or event, or any person considered merely as a cause: as, "We heard her say *it* was not he;" "The truth is, *it* was I that helped her."

RULE VI.

THE relative is the nominative case to the verb, when no nominative comes between it and the verb: as, "The master *who* taught us;" "The trees *which* are planted."

When a nominative comes between the relative and the verb, the relative is governed by some word in its own member of the sentence: as, "He *who* preserves me, to *whom* I owe my being, *whose* I am, and *whom* I serve, is eternal."

See vol. ii. p. 92.

IN the several members of the last sentence, the relative performs a different office. In the first member, it marks the agent; in the second, it submits to the government of the preposition; in the third, it represents the possessor;

and in the fourth, the object of an action: and, therefore, it must be in the three different cases, correspondent to those offices.

When both the antecedent and the relative become nominatives, each to different verbs, the relative is the nominative to the former, and the antecedent to the latter verb: as, "*True philosophy, which is* the ornament of our nature, *consists* more in the love of our duty, and the practice of virtue, than in great talents and extensive knowledge."

A few instances of erroneous construction will illustrate both the branches of the sixth rule. The three following refer to the first part. "How can we avoid being grateful to those whom, by repeated kind offices, have proved themselves our real friends?" "These are the men whom you might suppose, were the authors of the work:" "If you were here, you would find three or four, whom you would say passed their time agreeably:" in all these places it should be *who* instead of *whom*. The two latter sentences contain a nominative between the relative and the verb; and, therefore, seem to contravene the rule: but the student will reflect, that it is not the nominative of the verb with which the relative is connected. The remaining examples refer to the second part of the rule. "Men of fine talents are not always the persons who we should esteem." "The persons who you dispute with, are precisely of your opinion." "Our tutors are our benefactors, who we owe obedience to, and who we ought to love." In these sentences, *whom* should be used instead of *who*.

1. When the relative pronoun is of the interrogative kind, the noun or pronoun containing the answer, must be in the same case as that which contains the question: as, "*Whose* books are these? They are *John's*." "*Who* gave them to him? *We*." "Of *whom* did you buy them? Of

a bookseller; *him* who lives at the Bible and Crown." "*Whom* did you see there? Both *him* and the shopman." The learner will readily comprehend this rule, by supplying the words which are understood in the answers. Thus, to express the answers at large, we should say, "They are John's books." "We gave them to him." "We bought them of him who lives," &c. "We saw both him and the shopman."—As the relative pronoun, when used interrogatively, refers to the subsequent word or phrase containing the answer to the question, that word or phrase may properly be termed the *subsequent* to the interrogative.

Pronouns are sometimes made to precede the things which they represent: as, "If a man declares in autumn, when he is eating *them*, or in spring when there are *none*, that he loves *grapes*," &c. But this is a construction which is very seldom allowable.

RULE VII.

WHEN the relative is preceded by two nominatives of different persons, the relative and verb may agree in person with either, according to the sense: as, "I am the man *who command* you;" or, "I am the *man who commands* you."

See vol. ii. p. 94.

THE form of the first of the two preceding sentences, expresses the meaning rather obscurely. It would be more perspicuous to say; "I, who command you, am the man." Perhaps the difference of meaning, produced by referring the relative to different antecedents, will be more evident to the learner, in the following sentences. "I am the general who *gives* the orders to-day;" "I am the general, who *give* the orders to-day;" that is, "I, who give the orders to-day, am the general."

When the relative and the verb have been determined to agree with either of the preceding nominatives, that agreement must be preserved throughout the sentence; as, in the following instance: "I am the Lord that *maketh* all things; and *stretcheth* forth the heavens alone." *Isa.* xliv. 24. Thus far is consistent: The *Lord*, in the third person, is the antecedent, and the verb agrees with the relative in the third person: "I am *the Lord*, which Lord, or he that *maketh* all things." If *I* were made the antecedent, the relative and the verb should agree with it in the first person: as, *I* am the Lord, *that make* all things, *that stretch* forth the heavens alone." But should it follow; "*That spreadeth* abroad the earth by myself;" there would arise a confusion of persons, and a manifest solecism.

RULE VIII.

EVERY adjective, and every adjective pronoun, belongs to a substantive, expressed or understood: as, "He is a *good*, as well as a *wise man;*" "*Few* are *happy;*" that is "*persons:*" "*This* is a pleasant walk;" that is, "*This walk is,*" &c.

Adjective pronouns must agree, in number, with their substantives: as, "This book, these books; that sort, those sorts; another road, other roads."

See vol. ii. p. 95. and p. 322, the note.

1. ADJECTIVE PRONOUNS.

A few instances of the breach of this rule are here exhibited. "I have not travelled this twenty years;" "*these* twenty." "I am not recommending these kind of sufferings;" "*this* kind." "Those set of books was a valuable present;" "*that* set."

1. The word *means* in the singular number, and the phrases, "*By this means*," "*By that means*," are used by our best and most correct writers; namely, Bacon, Tillotson, Atterbury, Addison, Steele, Pope, &c*. They are,

---

* "*By this means* he had them the more at vantage, being tired and harassed with a long march."... *Bacon.*

"*By this means* one great restraint from doing evil, would be taken away." —"And *this* is *an* admirable *means* to improve men in virtue."—"*By that means* they have rendered their duty more difficult."...................... *Tillotson.*

"It renders us careless of approving ourselves to God, and by *that means* securing the continuance of his goodness." "A good character, when established, should not be rested in as an end, but employed as *a means* of doing still further good.".. *Atterbury.*

"*By this means* they are happy in each other." "He *by that means* preserves his superiority.".. *Addison.*

"Your vanity *by this means* will want its food."............................ *Steele.*

"*By this means* alone, their greatest obstacles will vanish."............... *Pope.*

"Which *custom* has proved the most effectual *means* to ruin the nobles." *Dean Swift.*

"There *is* no *means* of escaping the persecution."—"Faith is not only *a means* of obeying, but a principal act of obedience."...................... *Dr. Young.*

"He looked on money as *a* necessary *means* of maintaining and increasing power.".. *Lord Lyttelton's Henry II.*

"John was too much intimidated not to embrace *every means* afforded for his safety.".. *Goldsmith.*

"Lest *this means* should fail."—"By *means* of *ship-money*, the late king," &c. —"The *only means* of securing a durable peace."............................ *Hume.*

"*By this means* there was nothing left to the Parliament of Ireland," &c. .... *Blackstone.*

"*By this means* so many slaves escaped out of the hands of their masters.".. *Dr. Robertson.*

"*By this means* they bear witness to each other." .... *Burke.*

"*By this means* the wrath of man was made to turn against itself." *Dr. Blair.*

"A magazine, which has, by *this means*, contained," &c.—"Birds, in general, procure their food by *means* of their *beak*." .... *Dr. Paley.*

indeed, in so general and approved use, that it would appear awkward, if not affected, to apply the old singular form, and say, "By this *mean*; by that *mean*; it was by a *mean*;" although it is more agreeable to the general analogy of the language. "The word *means* (says Priestley) belongs to the class of words, which do not change their termination on account of number; for it is used alike in both numbers."

The word *amends* is used in this manner, in the following sentences: "Though he did not succeed, he gained the approbation of his country; and with *this amends* he was content." "Peace of mind is *an* honourable *amends* for the sacrifices of interest." "In return, he received the thanks of his employers, and the present of a large estate: *these* were ample *amends* for all his labours." "We have described the rewards of vice: the good man's *amends are* of a different nature."

It can scarcely be doubted, that this word *amends* (like the word *means*) had formerly its correspondent form in the singular number, as it is derived from the French *amende*, though now it is exclusively established in the plural form. If, therefore, it be alleged that *mean* should be applied in the singular, because it is derived from the French *moyen*, the same kind of argument may be advanced in favour of the singular *amende*: and the general analogy of the language may also be pleaded in support of it.

Campbell, in his "Philosophy of Rhetoric," has the following remark on the subject before us: "No persons of taste will, I presume, venture so far to violate the present usage, and consequently to shock the ears of the generality of readers, as to say, 'By this *mean*, by that *mean*.'"

Lowth and Johnson seem to be against the use of *means* in the singular number. They do not, however, speak

decisively on the point; but rather dubiously, and as if they knew that they were questioning eminent authorities, as well as general practice. That they were not decidedly against the application of this word to the singular number, appears from their own language: "Whole sentences, whether simple or compound, may become members of other sentences, by *means* of some additional *connexion*."—Dr. LOWTH'S *Introduction to English Grammar*.

"There is no other method of teaching that of which any one is ignorant, but by *means* of *something* already known." "Neither grace of person nor vigour of understanding, is to be regarded otherwise than as *a means* of happiness."—Dr. JOHNSON.

It is remarkable that our present version of the Scriptures makes no use, as far as the Compiler can discover, of the word *mean*; though there are several instances to be found in it of the use of *means*, in the sense and connexion contended for. "By *this means* thou shalt have no portion on this side the river." Ezra iv. 16. "That by *means* of *death*," &c. Heb. ix. 15. It will scarcely be pretended, that the translators of the sacred volumes did not accurately understand the English language; or that they would have admitted one form of this word, and rejected the other, had not their determination been conformable to the best usage. An attempt therefore to recover an old word, so long since disused by the most correct writers, seems not likely to be successful; especially as the rejection of it is not attended with any inconvenience.

The practice of the best and most correct writers, or a great majority of them, corroborated by general usage, forms, during its continuance, the standard of language; especially, if, in particular instances, this practice continue, after objection and due consideration. Every connexion and application of words and phrases, thus sup-

ported, must therefore be proper, and entitled to respect, if not exceptionable in a moral point of view.

"Sermo constat ratione, vetustate, auctoritate, consuetudine.
"Consuetudo verò certissima loquendi magistra."

QUINCTILIAN.

.... "Si volet usus
"Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi."

HORACE.

On this principle, many forms of expression, not less deviating from the general analogy of the language, than those before mentioned, are to be considered as strictly proper and justifiable. Of this kind are the following: "*None* of them *are* varied to express the gender;" and yet *none* originally signified *no one*. "He *himself* shall do the work:" here, what was at first appropriated to the objective, is now properly used as the nominative case. "*You* have behaved yourselves well:" in this example, the word *you* is put in the nominative case plural, with strict propriety; though formerly it was confined to the objective case, and *ye* exclusively used for the nominative.

With respect to anomalies and variations of language, thus established, it is the grammarian's business to submit, not to remonstrate. In pertinaciously opposing the decision of proper authority, and contending for obsolete modes of expression, he may, indeed, display learning and critical sagacity; and, in some degree, obscure points that are sufficiently clear and decided: but he cannot reasonably hope, either to succeed in his aims, or to assist the learner, in discovering and respecting the true standard and principles of language.

Cases which custom has left dubious, are certainly within the grammarian's province. Here, he may reason and remonstrate on the ground of derivation, analogy, and propriety; and his reasonings may refine and im-

prove the language: but when authority speaks out and decides the point, it were perpetually to unsettle the language, to admit of cavil and debate. Anomalies then, under the limitation mentioned, become the law, as clearly as the plainest analogies.

The reader will perceive that, in the following sentences, the use of the word *mean*, in the old form, has a very uncouth appearance: "By the *mean* of adversity, we are often instructed." "He preserved his health, by *mean* of exercise." "Frugality is one *mean* of acquiring a competency." They should be, "By *means* of adversity," &c. "By *means* of exercise," &c. "Frugality is one *means*," &c.

Good writers do indeed make use of the substantive *mean* in the singular number, and in that number only, to signify mediocrity, middle rate, &c.: as, "This is *a mean* between the two extremes." But in the sense of instrumentality, it has been long disused by the best authors, and by almost every writer.

This means and *that means* should be used only when they refer to what is singular; *these means* and *those means*, when they respect plurals: as, "He lived temperately, and by *this means* preserved his health;" "The scholars were attentive, industrious, and obedient to their tutors; and by *these means* acquired knowledge."

We have enlarged on this article, that the young student may be led to reflect on a point so important, as that of ascertaining the standard of propriety in the use of language.

2. When two persons or things are spoken of in a sentence, and there is occasion to mention them again for the sake of distinction, *that* is used in reference to the former, and *this* in reference to the latter: as, "Self-love, which is the spring of action in the soul, is ruled by rea-

son: but for *that*, man would be inactive; and but for *this*, he would be active to no end."

3. The distributive adjective pronouns, *each*, *every*, *either*, agree with the nouns, pronouns, and verbs, of the singular number only: as, "The king of Israel, and Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, sat *each* on *his* throne;" "*Every* tree *is* known by *its* fruit:" unless the plural noun convey a collective idea: as, "Every six months;" "Every hundred years."—The following phrases are exceptionable: "Let *each* esteem others better than themselves:" It ought to be "*himself*." "It is requisite that the language should be both perspicuous and correct: in proportion as *either* of these two qualities are wanting, the language is imperfect:" it should be, "*is* wanting." "*Every* one of the letters bear regular dates, and contain proofs of attachment:" "*bears a* regular *date*, and *contains*." "*Every* town and village were burned; *every* grove and *every* tree were cut down:" "*was* burned, and *was* cut down." "*Every* freeman, and *every* citizen, have a right to give their votes:" "*has* a right to give *his vote*."—*See vol. 2, p. 50, and p. 322; the Note.*

Either is often used improperly, instead of *each*: as, "The king of Israel, and Jehoshaphat the king of Judah, sat *either* of them on his throne;" "Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron took *either* of them his censer." *Each* signifies both of them taken distinctly or separately; *either* properly signifies only the one or the other of them, taken disjunctively.

In the course of this work, some examples will appear, of erroneous translations from the Holy Scriptures, with respect to grammatical construction: but it may be proper to remark, that notwithstanding these verbal mistakes, the Bible, for the size of it, is the most accurate grammatical composition that we have in the English language. The authority of several eminent grammarians might be adduced in support of this assertion; but it may be suffi-

cient to mention only that of Dr. Lowth, who says, "The present translation of the Bible, is the best standard of the English language."

II. ADJECTIVES.

4. Adjectives are sometimes improperly applied as adverbs: as, "Indifferent honest; excellent well; miserable poor;" instead of "Indifferently honest; excellently well; miserably poor." "He behaved himself conformable to that great example;" "*conformably*." "Endeavour to live hereafter suitable to persons in your station;" "*suitably*." "I can never think so very mean of him;" "*meanly*." "He describes this river agreeable to the common reading;" "*agreeably*." "Agreeable to my promise, I now write;" "*agreeably*." "Thy exceeding great reward." When united to an adjective, or adverb not ending in *ly*, the word *exceeding* has *ly* added to it: as, "exceedingly dreadful, exceedingly great;" "exceedingly well, exceedingly more active:" but when it is joined to an adverb or adjective, having that termination, the *ly* is omitted: as, "Some men think exceeding clearly, and reason exceeding forcibly:" "She appeared, on this occasion, exceeding lovely:" "He acted in this business *bolder* than was expected:" "They behaved the *noblest*, because they were disinterested." They should have been, "*more boldly; most nobly*."—The adjective pronoun *such* is often misapplied: as, "He was such an extravagant young man, that he spent his whole patrimony in a few years:" it should be, "*so extravagant a young man*." "I never before saw such large trees:" "*saw trees so large*." When we refer to the species or nature of a thing, the word *such* is properly applied: as, "Such a temper is seldom found:" but when degree is signified; we use the word *so*: as, "So bad a temper is seldom found."

Adverbs are likewise improperly used as adjectives: as, "The tutor addressed him in terms rather warm, but

suitably to his offence;" "*suitable*." "They were seen wandering about solitarily and distressed;" "*solitary*." "He lived in a manner agreeably to the dictates of reason and religion;" "*agreeable*." "The study of syntax should be previously to that of punctuation;" "*previous* *."

5. Double comparatives and superlatives should be avoided: such as, "A worser conduct;" "On lesser hopes;" "A more serener temper;" "The most straitest sect;" "A more superior work." They should be, "worse conduct;" "less hopes;" "a more serene temper;" "the straitest sect;" "a superior work."

6. Adjectives that have in themselves a superlative signification, do not properly admit of the superlative or comparative form superadded: such as, "Chief, extreme, perfect, right, universal, supreme," &c.; which are sometimes improperly written, "Chiefest, extremest, perfectest, rightest, most universal, most supreme," &c. The following expressions are therefore improper. "He sometimes claims admission to the *chiefest* offices;" "The quarrel became *so universal* and national;" "A method of attaining the *rightest* and greatest happiness." The phrases, so perfect, so right, so extreme, so universal, &c. are incorrect; because they imply that one thing is less perfect, less extreme, &c. than another, which is not possible.

7. Inaccuracies are often found in the way in which the degress of comparison are applied and construed. The following are examples of wrong construction in this respect: "This noble nation hath, of all others, admitted fewer corruptions." The word *fewer* is here construed precisely as if it were the superlative. It should be,

---

* For the rule to determine, whether an adjective or an adverb is to be used, see Volume II. The *Note* at the end of the promiscuous Exercises on Syntax, page 163.

"This noble nation hath admitted fewer corruptions than any other." We commonly say, "This is the weaker of the two;" or, "The weakest of the two:" but the former is the regular mode of expression, because there are only two things compared. "The vice of covetousness is what enters deepest into the soul of any other." "He celebrates the church of England as the most perfect of all others." Both these modes of expression are faulty: we should not say, "The best of any man," or, "The best of any other man," for "the best of men." The sentences may be corrected by substituting the comparative in the room of the superlative. "The vice, &c. is what enters deeper into the soul than any other." "He celebrates, &c. as more perfect, or less imperfect, than any other." It is also possible to retain the superlative, and render the expression grammatical. "Covetousness, of all vices, enters the deepest into the soul." "He celebrates, &c. as the most perfect of all churches." These sentences contain other errors, against which it is proper to caution the learner. The words *deeper* and *deepest*, being intended for adverbs, should have been *more deeply*, *most deeply*. The phrases *more perfect*, and *most perfect*, are improper; because perfection admits of no degrees of comparison. We may say *nearer* or *nearest* to perfection, or more or less imperfect.

8. In some cases, adjectives should not be separated from their substantives, even by words which modify their meaning, and make but one sense with them: as, "A large enough number surely." It should be, a "number large enough." "The lower sort of people are good enough judges of one not very distant from them."

The adjective is usually placed before its substantive: as, "A *generous* man;" "How *amiable* a woman!" The instances in which it comes after the substantive, are the following:

1st, When something depends upon the adjective; and when it gives a better sound, especially in poetry: as, "A man *generous* to his enemies;" "Feed me with food *convenient* for me;" "A tree three feet *thick*;" "A body of troops fifty thousand *strong*;" "The torrent tumbling through rocks *abrupt*."

2d, When the adjective is emphatical: as, "Alexander the *Great*;" "Lewis the *Bold*;" "Goodness *infinite*;" "Wisdom *unsearchable*."

3d, When several adjectives belong to one substantive: as, "A man just, wise, and charitable;" "A woman modest, sensible, and virtuous."

4th, When the adjective is preceded by an adverb: as, "A boy regularly studious;" "A girl unaffectedly modest."

5th, When the verb *to be*, in any of its variations, comes between a substantive and an adjective, the adjective may frequently either precede or follow it: as, "The man is *happy*;" or, "*happy* is the man who makes virtue his choice:" "The interview was *delightful*;" or, "*delightful* was the interview."

6th, When the adjective expresses some circumstance of a substantive placed after an active verb: as, "Vanity often renders its possessor *despicable*." In an exclamatory sentence, the adjective generally precedes the substantive; as, "How *despicable* does vanity often render its possessor?"

There is sometimes great beauty, as well as force, in placing the adjective before the verb, and the substantive immediately after it: as, "Great is the Lord! just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints!"

Sometimes the word *all* is emphatically put after a number of particulars comprehended under it. "Ambition, interest, honour, *all* concurred." Sometimes a substantive, which likewise comprehends the preceding particulars, is used in conjunction with this adjective pronoun:

as, "Royalists, republicans, churchmen, sectaries, courtiers, patriots, *all parties*, concurred in the illusion."

An adjective pronoun, in the plural number, will sometimes properly associate with a singular noun: as, "Our desire, your intention, their resignation." This association applies rather to things of an intellectual nature, than to those which are corporeal. It forms an exception to the general rule.

A substantive with its adjective is reckoned as one compounded word; whence they often take another adjective, and sometimes a third, and so on: as, "An old man; a good old man; a very learned, judicious, good old man."

Though the adjective always relates to a substantive, it is, in many instances, put as if it were absolute; especially where the noun has been mentioned before, or is easily understood, though not expressed: as, "I often survey the green fields, as I am very fond of *green*;" "The wise, the virtuous, the honoured, famed, and great," that is, "persons;" "The twelve," that is, "apostles;" "Have compassion on the *poor*; be feet to the *lame*, and eyes to the *blind*."

Substantives are often used as adjectives. In this case, the word so used is sometimes unconnected with the substantive to which it relates; sometimes connected with it by a hyphen; and sometimes joined to it, so as to make the two words coalesce. The total separation is proper, when either of the two words is long, or when they cannot be fluently pronounced as one word: as, an adjective pronoun, a silver watch, a stone cistern: the hyphen is used, when both the words are short, and are readily pronounced as a single word: as, coal-mine, corn-mill, fruit-tree: the words coalesce, when they are readily pronounced together; have a long established association; and are in frequent use: as, honeycomb, gingerbread, inkhorn, Yorkshire.

Sometimes the adjective becomes a substantive, and has another adjective joined to it: as, "The chief good;" "The vast immense of space."

Some adjectives of number are more easily converted into substantives, than others. Thus we more readily say, "A million of men," than "a thousand of men." On the other hand, it will hardly be allowable to say, "A million men," whereas, "a thousand men" is quite familiar. Yet in the plural number, a different construction seems to be required. We say, "some hundreds," or "thousands," as well as "millions of men." Perhaps, on this account, the words *million*, *hundreds*, and *thousands*, will be said to be substantives.

When an adjective has a preposition before it, and the substantive is understood, the words assume the nature of an adverb, and may be considered as an adverbial phrase; as, "In general, in particular, in common," &c.; that is, "Generally, particularly, commonly."

Enow was formerly used as the plural of *enough:* but it is now obsolete.

RULE IX.

The article *a* or *an* agrees with nouns in the singular number only, individually or collectively: as, "A christian, an infidel, a score, a thousand."

The definite article *the* may agree with nouns in the singular and plural number: as, "The garden, the houses, the stars."

The articles are often properly omitted: when used, they should be justly applied, according to their distinct nature: as, "Gold is corrupting; the sea is green; a lion is bold."

See vol. ii. p. 100.

It is of the nature of both the articles to determine or limit the thing spoken of. *A* determines it to be one

single thing of the kind, leaving it still uncertain which: *the* determines which it is, or of many, which they are.

The following passage will serve as an example of the different uses of *a* and *the*, and of the force of the substantive without any article. "*Man* was made for society, and ought to extend his good will to all men: but *a man* will naturally entertain a more particular kindness for *the men*, with whom he has the most frequent intercourse; and enter into a still closer union with *the man* whose temper and disposition suit best with his own."

There is, in some instances, a peculiar delicacy in the application or omission of the indefinite article. This will be seen in the following sentences. We commonly say; "I do not intend to turn critic on this occasion;" not "turn *a* critic." On the other hand, we properly add the article in this phrase; "I do not intend to become *a* critic in this business;" not, "to become critic." It is correct to say, with the article, "He is in *a* great hurry;" but not, "in great hurry." And yet, in this expression, "He is in great haste," the article should be omitted: it would be improper to say, "He is in *a* great haste." A nice discernment, and accurate attention to the best usage, are necessary to direct us, on these occasions.

As the articles are sometimes misapplied, it may be of some use to exhibit a few instances: "And I persecuted this way unto *the* death." The apostle does not mean any particular sort of death, but death in general: the definite article therefore is improperly used: it ought to be "unto death," without any article.

"When he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth;" that is, according to this translation, "into all truth whatsoever, into truth of all kinds;" very different from the meaning of the evangelist, and from the original, "into all *the* truth;" that is, "into all evangelical truth, all truth necessary for you to know."

"Who breaks a butterfly upon *a* wheel?" it ought to be "*the* wheel," used as an instrument for the particular purpose of torturing criminals. "The Almighty hath given reason to *a* man to be a light unto him:" it should rather be, "to *man*," in general. "This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is *the* son of Abraham:" it ought to be, "*a* son of Abraham."

These remarks may serve to show the great importance of the proper use of the article, and the excellence of the English language in this respect; which, by means of its two articles, does most precisely determine the extent of signification of common names.

1. A nice distinction of the sense is sometimes made by the use or omission of the article *a*. If I say, "He behaved with *a* little reverence;" my meaning is positive. If I say, "He behaved with little reverence;" my meaning is negative. And these two are by no means the same, or to be used in the same cases. By the former, I rather praise a person; by the latter, I dispraise him. For the sake of this distinction, which is a very useful one, we may better bear the seeming impropriety of the article *a* before nouns of number. When I say, "There were few men with him;" I speak diminutively, and mean to represent them as inconsiderable: whereas, when I say, "There were *a* few men with him;" I evidently intend to make the most of them.

2. In general, it may be sufficient to prefix the article to the former of two words in the same construction; though the French never fail to repeat it in this case. "There were many hours, both of the night and day, which he could spend, without suspicion, in solitary thought." It might have been "of *the* night and *of the* day." And, for the sake of emphasis, we often repeat the article in a series of epithets. "He hoped that this title would secure him *an* ample and *an* independent authority."

3. In common conversation, and in familiar style, we frequently omit the articles, which might be inserted with propriety in writing, especially in a grave style. "At worst, time might be gained by this expedient." "At *the* worst," would have been better in this place. "Give me here John Baptist's head. There would have been more dignity in saying, "John *the* Baptist's head;" or, "The head of John *the* Baptist."

The article *the* has sometimes a good effect, in distinguishing a person by an epithet. "In the history of Henry the fourth, by Father Daniel, we are surprised at not finding him *the* great man." "I own I am often surprised that he should have treated so coldly, a man so much *the* gentleman."

This article is often elegantly put, after the manner of the French, for the pronoun possessive: as, "He looks him full in *the* face;" that is, "in *his* face." "In his presence they were to strike *the* forehead on the ground;" that is, "*their foreheads.*"

We sometimes, according to the French manner, repeat the same article, when the adjective, on account of any clause depending upon it, is put after the substantive. "Of all the considerable governments among the Alps, a commonwealth is a constitution *the* most adapted of any to the poverty of those countries." "With such a specious title as that of blood, which with the multitude is always a claim, *the* strongest, and *the* most easily comprehended." "They are not the men in the nation *the* most difficult to be replaced."

The definite article is likewise used to distinguish between things, which are individually different, but have one generic name, and things which are, in truth, one and the same, but are characterized by several qualities. If we say, "The ecclesiastical and secular powers con-

curred in this measure," the expression is ambiguous, as far as language can render it such. The reader's knowledge, as Dr. Campbell observes, may prevent his mistaking it; but, if such modes of expression be admitted, where the sense is clear, they may inadvertently be imitated, in cases where the meaning would be obscure, if not entirely misunderstood. The error might have been avoided, either by repeating the substantive, or by subjoining the substantive to the first adjective, and prefixing the article to both adjectives; or by placing the substantive after both adjectives, the article being prefixed in the same manner: as, "The ecclesiastical powers, and the secular powers;" or better, "The ecclesiastical powers, and the secular;" or, "The ecclesiastical, and the secular powers." The repetition of the article shows, that the second adjective is not an additional epithet to the same subject, but belongs to a subject totally different, though expressed by the same generic name. "The lords spiritual and temporal," is a phraseology objectionable on the same principle, though now so long sanctioned by usage, that we scarcely dare question its propriety. The subjects are different, though they have but one generic name. The phrase should, therefore, have been, "The spiritual and the temporal lords."—On the contrary, when two or more adjectives belong, as epithets, to one and the same thing, the other arrangement is to be preferred: as, "The high and mighty states." Here both epithets belong to one subject. "The states high and mighty," would convey the same idea.

The indefinite article has, sometimes, the meaning of *every* or *each*: as, "They cost five shillings a dozen;" that is, "every dozen."

"A man he was to all the country dear,
"And passing rich with forty pounds a year."........*Goldsmith.*

that is, "every year."

There is a particular use of the indefinite article, which deserves attention, as ambiguity may, by this means, be, in some cases, avoided. Thus, if we say, "He is a better soldier than scholar," the article is suppressed before the second term, and the expression is equivalent to, "He is more warlike than learned;" or, "He possesses the qualities, which form the soldier, in a greater degree than those, which constitute the scholar." If we say, "He would make a better soldier than *a* scholar," the article is prefixed to the second term, and the meaning is, "He would make a better soldier than a scholar would make;" that is, "He has more of the constituent qualities of a soldier, than are to be found in any literary man." These two phraseologies are frequently confounded, which seldom fails to produce uncertainty of meaning. In the former case, the subject, as possessing different qualities in various degrees, is compared with itself; in the latter, it is compared with something else.

RULE X.

ONE substantive governs another, signifying a different thing, in the possessive or genitive case: as, "My father's house; "Man's happiness;" "Virtue's reward."

See vol. ii. p. 103.

WHEN the annexed substantive signifies the same thing as the first, and serves merely to explain or describe it, there is no variation of case: as, "George, king of Great Britain, elector of Hanover," &c.; "Pompey contended with Cæsar, the greatest general of his time;" "Religion, the support of adversity, adorns prosperity." Nouns thus circumstanced are said to be *in apposition* to each other. The interposition of a relative and verb will sometimes break the construction: as, "Pompey contended with Cæsar, *who was* the greatest general of his time." Here the word *general* is in the nominative case, governed by

note 4, under RULE XI.—Both the parts of this rule are exemplified in the following sentences: "Maria rejected Valerius, the *man* whom she had rejected before;" "Maria rejected Valerius, *who was he* that she had rejected before."

Nouns are not unfrequently set in apposition to sentences, or clauses of sentences: as, "If a man had a positive idea of infinite, either duration or space, he could add two infinites together; nay, make one infinite infinitely bigger than another; *absurdities* too gross to be confuted." Here the *absurdities* are the whole preceding propositions. "You are too humane and considerate; *things* which few people can be charged with." Here *things* are in apposition to *humane* and *considerate.*—This construction is not to be recommended, when the parts of the sentence are long, or numerous. The first of the preceding examples, is, therefore, improvable. It would have been better, if a fresh sentence had been introduced, thus: "These are absurdities," &c.

The preposition *of* joined to a substantive, is frequently equivalent to the possessive case: as, "A Christian's hope," "The hope of a Christian." But it is only so, when the expression can be converted into the regular form of the possessive case. We can say, "The reward of virtue," and "Virtue's reward:" but though it is proper to say, "A crown of gold," we cannot convert the expression into the possessive case, and say, "Gold's crown."

Substantives govern pronouns as well as nouns, in the possessive case: as, "Every tree is known by *its* fruit;" "Goodness brings *its* reward;" "That desk is *mine*."

The genitive *its* is often improperly used for *'tis* or *it is:* as, "Its my book;" instead of, "It is my book."

The pronoun *his*, when detached from the noun to which it relates, is to be considered, not as a possessive pronoun, but as the genitive case of the personal pronoun: as, "This composition is *his*." "Whose book is that?" "*His*." If we use the noun itself, we should say,

"This composition is John's." "Whose book is that?" "Eliza's." The position will be still more evident, when we consider that both the pronouns, in the following sentence, must have a similar construction: "Is it *her* or *his* honour that is tarnished?" "It is not *hers*, but *his*."

Sometimes a substantive in the genitive or possessive case stands alone, the latter one by which it is governed being understood: as, "I called at the bookseller's," that is, "at the bookseller's *shop*."

1. If several nouns come together in the genitive case, the apostrophe with *s* is annexed to the last, and understood to the rest: as, "John and Eliza's books:" "This was my father, mother, and uncle's advice." But when any words intervene, perhaps on account of the increased pause, the sign of the possessive should be annexed to each: as, "They are John's as well as Eliza's books;" "I had the physician's, the surgeon's, and the apothecary's assistance." The following distinction, on this point, appears to be worthy of attention. When any subject or subjects are considered as the common property of two or more persons, the sign of the possessive case, is affixed only to the name of the last person: as, "This is Henry, William, and Joseph's estate." But when several subjects are considered, as belonging separately to distinct individuals, the names of the individuals have the sign of the possessive case annexed to each of them: as, "These are Henry's, William's, and Joseph's estates."—It is, however, better to say, "It was the advice of my father, mother, and uncle;" "I had the assistance of the physician, the surgeon, and the apothecary;" "This estate belongs in common to Henry, William, and Joseph."

2. In poetry, the addditional *s* is frequently omitted, but the apostrophe retained, in the same manner as in sub-

stantives of the plural number ending in *s*: as, "The wrath of Peleus' son." This seems not so allowable in prose; which the following erroneous examples will demonstrate: "Moses' minister;" "Phinehas' wife;" "Festus came into Felix' room." "These answers were made to the witness' questions." But in cases which would give too much of the hissing sound, or increase the difficulty of pronunciation, the omission takes place even in prose: as, "For righteousness' sake;" "For conscience' sake."

3. Little explanatory circumstances are particularly awkward between a genitive case, and the word which usually follows it: as, "She began to extol the farmer's, as she called him, excellent understanding." It ought to be, "the excellent understanding of the farmer, as she called him."—The word in the genitive case is frequently placed improperly: as, "This fact appears from Dr. Pearson of Birmingham's experiments." It should be, "from the experiments of Dr. Pearson of Birmingham."

4. When a sentence consists of terms signifying a name and an office, or of any expressions by which one part is descriptive or explanatory of the other, it may occasion some doubt to which of them the sign of the genitive case should be annexed; or whether it should be subjoined to them both. Thus, some would say; "I left the parcel at Smith's the bookseller;" others, "at Smith the bookseller's;" and perhaps others, "at Smith's the bookseller's." The first of these forms is most agreeable to the English idiom; and if the addition consists of two or more words, the case seems to be less dubious: as, "I left the parcel at Smith's, the bookseller and stationer." The point will be still clearer, if we supply the ellipsis in these sentences, and give the equivalent phrases, at large: thus; "I left the parcel at the house of Smith the bookseller;" "I left

it at Smith the house of the bookseller." "I left it at the house of Smith the house of the bookseller." By this process, it is evident, that only the first mode of expression is correct and proper. But as this subject requires a little further explanation, to make it intelligible to the learners, we shall add a few observations calculated to unfold its principles.

A phrase in which the words are so connected and dependent, as to admit of no pause before the conclusion, necessarily requires the genitive sign at or near the end of the phrase: as, "Whose prerogative is it? It is the king of Great Britain's;" "That is the duke of Bridgewater's canal;" "The bishop of Landaff's excellent book;" "The Lord mayor of London's authority;" "The captain of the guard's house."

When words in apposition follow each other in quick succession, it seems also most agreeable to our idiom, to give the sign of the genitive a similar situation; especially if the noun which governs the genitive be expressed: as, "The emperor Leopold's;" "Dionysius the tyrant's;" "For David my *servant's* sake;" "Give me John the *Baptist's* head;" "Paul the *apostle's* advice." But when a pause is proper, and the governing noun not expressed; and when the latter part of the sentence is extended; it appears to be requisite that the sign should be applied to the first genitive, and understood to the other: as, "I reside at lord Stormont's, my old patron and benefactor;" "Whose glory did he emulate? He emulated Cæsar's, the greatest general of antiquity." In the following sentences, it would be very awkward to place the sign, either at the end of each of the clauses, or at the end of the latter one alone: "These psalms are David's, the king, priest, and prophet of the Jewish people;" "We staid a month at lord Lyttelton's, the ornament of his country, and the friend of every virtue." The sign of the genitive case may very properly be understood at the end of these

members, an ellipsis at the latter part of sentences being a common construction in our language; as the learner will see by one or two examples: "They wished to submit, but he did not;" that is, "he did not *wish to submit;*" "He said it was their concern, but not his;" that is, "*not his concern.*"

If we annex the sign of the genitive to the end of the last clause only, we shall perceive that a resting place is wanted, and that the connecting circumstance is placed too remotely, to be either perspicuous or agreeable: as, "Whose glory did he emulate?" "He emulated Cæsar, the greatest general of *antiquity's.*" "These psalms are David, the king, priest, and prophet of the Jewish *people's.*" It is much better to say, "This is *Paul's* advice, the Christian hero, and great apostle of the Gentiles," than, "This is Paul the Christian hero, and great apostle of the *Gentiles'* advice." On the other hand, the application of the genitive sign to both or all of the nouns in apposition, would be generally harsh and displeasing, and perhaps in some cases incorrect: as, "The emperor's Leopold's;" "King's George's;" "Charles's the second's;" "The parcel was left at Smith's, the bookseller's and stationer's." The rules which we have endeavoured to elucidate, will prevent the inconveniences of both these modes of expression; and they appear to be simple, perspicuous, and consistent with the idiom of the language.

5. The English genitive has often an unpleasant sound; so that we daily make more use of the particle *of* to express the same relation. There is something awkward in the following sentences, in which this method has not been taken. "The general, in the army's name, published a declaration." "The commons' vote." "The Lords' house." "Unless he is very ignorant of the kingdom's condition." It were certainly better to say, "In the name of the army;" "The votes of the commons;"

"The house of lords;" "The condition of the kingdom." It is also rather harsh to use two English genitives with the same substantive: as, "Whom he acquainted with the pope's and the king's pleasure." "The pleasure of the pope and the king," would have been better.

We sometimes meet with three substantives dependent on one another, and connected by the preposition *of* applied to each of them: as, "The severity of the distress of the son of the king, touched the nation;" but this mode of expression is not to be recommended. It would be better to say, "The severe distress of the king's son, touched the nation." We have a striking instance of this laborious mode of expression, in the following sentence: "*Of* some *of* the books *of* each *of* these classes *of* literature, a catalogue will be given at the end of the work."

6. In some cases, we use both the genitive termination and the preposition *of*: as, "It is a discovery of Sir Isaac Newton's." Sometimes indeed, unless we throw the sentence into another form, this method is absolutely necessary, in order to distinguish the sense, and to give the idea of property, strictly so called, which is the most important of the relations expressed by the genitive case: for the expressions, "This picture of my friend," and "This picture of my friend's," suggest very different ideas. The latter only is that of property in the strictest sense. The idea would, doubtless, be conveyed in a better manner, by saying, "This picture belonging to my friend."

When this double genitive, as some grammarians term it, is not necessary to distinguish the sense, and especially in a grave style, it is generally omitted. Except to prevent ambiguity, it seems to be allowable only in cases which suppose the existence of a plurality of subjects of the same kind. In the expressions, "A subject of the emperor's;" "A sentiment of my brother's;" more than

one subject and one sentiment, are supposed to belong to the possessor. But when this plurality is neither intimated, nor necessarily supposed, the double genitive, except as before mentioned, should not be used: as, "This house of the governor is very commodious;" "The crown of the king was stolen;" "That privilege of the scholar was never abused." (See page 87.) But after all that can be said for this double genitive, as it is termed, some grammarians think, that it would be better to avoid the use of it altogether, and to give the sentiment another form of expression.

7. When an entire clause of a sentence, beginning with a participle of the present tense, is used as one name, or to express one idea or circumstance, the noun on which it depends may be put in the genitive case: thus, instead of saying, "What is the reason of this person dismissing his servant so hastily?" that is, "What is the reason of this person, in dismissing his servant so hastily?" we may say, and perhaps ought to say, "What is the reason of this person's dismissing of his servant so hastily?" Just as we say, "What is the reason of this person's hasty dismission of his servant?" So also, we say, "I remember it being reckoned a great exploit;" or more properly, "I remember its being reckoned," &c. The following sentence is correct and proper: "Much will depend on the *pupil's composing*, but more on *his reading* frequently." It would not be accurate to say, "Much will depend on the *pupil composing*," &c. We also properly say; "This will be the effect *of the pupil's composing* frequently;" instead of, "*Of the pupil composing* frequently." The participle, in such constructions, does the office of a substantive; and it should therefore have a correspondent regimen.

RULE XI.

Active verbs govern the objective case: as, "Truth ennobles *her*;" "She comforts *me*;" "They support *us*;" "Virtue rewards *her followers*."

See vol. ii. p. 106.

In English, the nominative case, denoting the subject, usually goes before the verb; and the objective case, denoting the object, follows the verb active; and it is the order that determines the case in *nouns:* as, "Alexander conquered the Persians." But the *pronoun* having a proper form for each of those cases, is sometimes, when it is in the objective case, placed before the verb; and, when it is in the nominative case, follows the object and verb: as, "*Whom* ye ignorantly worship, *him* declare I unto you."

This position of the pronoun sometimes occasions its proper case and government to be neglected; as in the following instances: "Who should I esteem more than the wise and good?" "By the character of those who you choose for your friends, your own is likely to be formed." "Those are the persons who he thought true to his interest." "Who should I see the other day but my old friend?" "Whosoever the court favours." In all these places it ought to be *whom*, the relative being governed in the objective case by the verbs "esteem, choose, thought," &c. "He, who under all proper circumstances, has the boldness to speak truth, choose for thy friend;" It should be "*him* who," &c.

Verbs neuter do not act upon, or govern, nouns and pronouns. "He *sleeps; they muse*," &c. are not transitive. They are, therefore, not followed by an objective case, specifying the object of an action. But when this case, or an object of action, comes after such verbs, though it may carry the appearance of being governed by them, it is generally affected by a preposition or some

other word understood: as, "He resided many years [that is, *for* or *during* many years] in that street;" "He rode several miles [that is, *for* or *through* the space of several miles] on that day;" "He lay an hour [that is *during* an hour] in great torture." In the phrases, "To dream a dream," "To live a virtuous life," "To run a race," "To walk the horse," "To dance the child;" the verbs certainly assume a transitive form, and may not, in these cases, be improperly denominated transitive verbs.

Part of a sentence, as well as a noun or pronoun, may be said to be in the objective case, or to be put objectively, governed by the active verb: as, "We sometimes see *virtue in distress:* but we should consider *how great will be her ultimate reward.*" Sentences or phrases under this circumstance, may be termed *objective sentences* or *phrases.*

1. Some writers, however, use certain neuter verbs as if they were transitive, putting after them the objective case, agreeably to the French construction of reciprocal verbs; but this custom is so foreign to the idiom of the English tongue, that it ought not to be adopted or imitated. The following are some instances of this practice. "*Repenting* him of his design." "The king soon found reason *to repent* him of his provoking such dangerous enemies." "The popular lords did not fail to *enlarge* themselves on the subject." "The nearer his successes *approached* him to the throne." "Go *flee* thee away into the land of Judah." "I think it by no means a fit and decent thing to *vie* charities," &c. "They have spent their whole time and pains, to *agree* the sacred with the profane chronology.

2. Active verbs are sometimes as improperly made neuter: as, "I must *premise* with three circumstances." "Those that think to *ingratiate with* him by calumniating me." They should be, "premise three circumstances;" "ingratiate themselves with him."

3. The neuter verb is varied like the active; but, having in some degree the nature of the passive, it admits, in many instances, of the passive form, retaining still the neuter signification, chiefly in such verbs as signify some sort of motion, or change of place or condition: as, "I am come; I was gone; I am grown; I was fallen." The following examples, however, appear to be erroneous, in giving the neuter verbs a passive form, instead of an active one. "The rule of our holy religion, from which we *are* infinitely *swerved*." "The whole obligation of that law and covenant *was* also *ceased*." "Whose number *was* now *amounted* to three hundred." "This mareschal, upon some discontent, *was entered* into a conspiracy against his master." "At the end of a campaign, when half the men *are deserted* or killed." They should be, "*have* swerved, *had* ceased," &c.

4. The verb *to be*, through all its variations, has the same case after it, expressed or understood, as that which next precedes it: "*I* am *he* whom they invited;" "*It* may be (or might have been) *he*, but *it* cannot be (or could not have been) *I*;" "*It* is impossible to be *they*;" "*It* seems to have been *he*, who conducted himself so wisely;" "*It* appears to be *she* that transacted the business;" "I understood *it* to be *him*;" "I believe *it* to have been *them*;" "We at first took *it* to be *her*; but were afterwards convinced that *it* was not *she*." "He is not the person *who* it seemed he was." "He is really the person *who* he appeared to be." "She is not now the woman *whom* they represented *her* to have been." "*Whom* do you fancy *him* to be?" "*He* desired to be their *king*;" "They desired *him* to be their *king*." By these examples it appears that this substantive verb has no government of case, but serves, in all its forms, as a conductor to the cases; so that the two cases which, in the construction of the sentence, or member of the sentence, are

the *next* before and after it, must always be alike. Perhaps this subject will be more intelligible to the learner, by observing, that the words in the cases preceding and following the verb *to be*, may be said to be *in apposition* to each other. Thus, in the sentence, " I understood it to be him," the words *it* and *him* are in apposition; that is, " they refer to the same thing, and are in the same case."—If this rule be considered as applying to simple sentences, or to the simple members of compound sentences, the difficulties respecting it, will be still farther diminished.

The following sentences contain deviations from the rule, and exhibit the pronoun in a wrong case: " It might have been *him*, but there is no proof of it;" " Though I was blamed, it could not have been *me*;" " I saw one whom I took to be *she*;" " She is the person *who* I understood it to have been;" " *Who* do you think me to be?" " *Whom* do men say that I am?" " And *whom* think ye that I am?"

In the last example, the natural arrangement is, " Ye think that I am whom;" where, contrary to the rule, the nominative *I* precedes, and the objective case *whom* follows the verb. The best method of discovering the proper case of the pronoun, in such phrases as the preceding, is, to turn them into declarative expressions, and to substitute the antecedent for the pronoun, as the pronoun must be in the same case as the antecedent would be in, if substituted for it. Thus, the question, " Whom do men say that I am?" if turned into a declarative sentence, with the antecedent, would be, " Men do say that I am he:" consequently the relative must be in the same case as *he*; that is, the nominative *who*, and not *whom*. In the same manner, in the phrase, " Who should I see but my old friend?" if we turn it into a declarative one, as, " I should see him, my old friend," we shall perceive that the relative is governed by the verb; as *him* and *my*

friend are in the objective case, and that it ought to be in the same case; that is, *whom*, and not *who*.

When the verb *to be* is *understood*, it has the same case before and after it, as when it is *expressed*: as, "*He* seems the *leader* of the party;" "*He* shall continue *steward*;" "They appointed *me executor*;" "I supposed *him* a *man* of learning:" that is, "He seems *to be* the leader of the party," &c.

Passive verbs which signify *naming*, and others of a similar nature, have the same case before and after them: as, "*He* was called *Cæsar*;" "*She* was named *Penelope*;" "*Homer* is styled the *prince* of poets;" "*James* was created a *duke*;" "The *general* was saluted *emperor*;" "The *professor* was appointed *tutor* to the prince;" "He caused *himself* to be proclaimed *king*;" "The senate adjudged *him* to be declared a *traitor*."

From the observations and examples which have been produced, under this 4th subordinate rule, it is evident that certain other neuter verbs, besides the verb *to be*, require the same case, whether it be the nominative or the objective, before and after them. The verbs to become, to wander, to go, to return, to expire, to appear, to die, to live, to look, to grow, to seem, to roam, and several others, are of this nature. "After this event, *he* became *physician* to the king;" "*She* wanders an *outcast*;" "He forced *her* to wander an *outcast*;" "*He* went out *mate*, but *he* returned *captain*;" "And *Swift* expires a *driv'ler* and a *show*;" "This conduct made *him* appear an *encourager* of every virtue;" *Hortensius* died a *martyr*;" "The gentle *Sidney* lived the shepherd's *friend*."

All the examples under this 4th division of the Eleventh Rule, and all others of a similar construction, may be explained on the principle, that nouns and pronouns are in the same case, when they signify the same thing, the one merely describing or elucidating the other.

5. The auxiliary *let* governs the objective case: as, "Let *him* beware;" "Let *us* judge candidly;" "Let *them* not presume;" "Let *George* study his lesson.

Some of our verbs appear to govern two words in the objective case: as, "The Author of my being formed *me man*, and made me accountable to him." "They desired me to call *them brethren*." "He seems to have made *him what* he was."

We sometimes meet with such expressions as these: "They were asked a question;" "They were offered a pardon;" "He had been left a great estate by his father." In these phrases, verbs passive are made to govern the objective case. This license is not to be approved. The expressions should be; "A question was put to them;" "A pardon was offered to them;" "His father left him a great estate."

RULE XII.

One verb governs another that follows it, or depends upon it, in the infinitive mood: as, "Cease *to do* evil; learn *to do* well:" "We should be prepared *to render* an account of our actions."

The preposition *to*, though generally used before the latter verb, is sometimes properly omitted: as, "I heard him say it;" instead of "*to* say it."

See vol. ii. p. 109.

This rule refers to principal, not to auxiliary verbs. If the student reflects, that the principal and its auxiliary form but one verb, he will have little or no difficulty, in the proper application of the present rule.

The verbs which have commonly other verbs following them in the infinitive mood, without the sign *to*, are Bid, dare, need, make, see, hear, feel; and also, let, not used as an auxiliary; and perhaps a few others: as, "I bade him do it;" "Ye dare not do it;" "I saw him do it;" "I heard him say it;" "Thou lettest him go."

This irregularity extends only to active or neuter verbs: for all the verbs abovementioned, when made passive, require the preposition *to* before the following verb: as, "He was seen *to go*;" "He was heard *to speak* in his own defence;" "They were bidden *to be* upon their guard."

1. In the following passages, the word *to*, the sign of the infinitive mood, where it is distinguished by Italic characters, is superfluous and improper. "I have observed some satirists *to* use," &c. "To see so many *to* make so little conscience of so great a sin." "It cannot but be a delightful spectacle to God and angels, to see a young person, besieged by powerful temptations on every side, *to* acquit himself gloriously, and resolutely *to* hold out against the most violent assaults; to behold one in the prime and flower of his age, that is courted by pleasures and honours, by the devil, and all the bewitching vanities of the world, *to* reject all these, and *to* cleave steadfastly unto God."

This mood has also been improperly used in the following places: "I am not like other men, *to* envy the talents I cannot reach." "Grammarians have denied, or at least doubted, them *to be* genuine." "That all our doings may be ordered by thy governance, *to do* always what is righteous in thy sight."

The infinitive is frequently governed by adjectives, substantives, and participles: as, "He is eager to learn;" "She is worthy to be loved;" "They have a desire to improve;" "Endeavouring to persuade."

The infinitive sometimes follows the word *as*: thus, "An object so high *as to be* invisible;" "A question so obscure *as to perplex* the understanding."

The infinitive occasionally follows *than* after a comparison: as, "He desired nothing more *than to know* his own imperfections."

The infinitive mood has much of the nature of a substantive, expressing the action itself which the verb signifies, as the participle has the nature of an adjective. Thus the

infinitive mood does the office of a substantive in different cases: in the nominative: as, "To *play* is pleasant:" in the objective: as, "Boys love to *play*;" "For *to will* is present with me; but *to perform* that which is good, I find not."

The infinitive mood is often made absolute, or used independently on the rest of the sentence, supplying the place of the conjunction *that* with the potential mood: as, "To confess the truth, I was in fault;" "To begin with the first;" "To proceed;" "To conclude;" that is, "That I may confess," &c.

The preposition *to*, signifying *in order to*, was anciently preceded by *for*: as, "What went ye out *for to see*." The word *for* before the infinitive, is now, in almost every case, obsolete. It is, however, still used, if the subject of the affirmation intervenes between that preposition and the verb: as, "*For* holy persons to be humble, is as hard, as *for* a prince *to submit* himself to be guided by tutors."

RULE XIII.

In the use of words and phrases which, in point of time, relate to each other, a due regard to that relation should be observed. Instead of saying, "The Lord *hath given*, and the Lord hath taken away;" we should say, "The Lord *gave*," and the Lord *hath taken* away." Instead of, "I *remember* the family more than twenty years;" it should be, "I *have remembered* the family more than twenty years."

See vol. ii. p. 110.

It is not easy, in all cases, to give particular rules, for the management of words and phrases which relate to one another, so that they may be proper and consistent. The best rule that can be given, is this very general one, "To observe what the sense necessarily requires." It may, however, be of use, to exhibit a number of instances, in

which the construction is irregular. The following are of this nature.

"I have completed the work more than a week ago;" "I have seen the coronation at Westminster last summer." These sentences should have been; "I *completed* the work," &c.; "I *saw* the coronation," &c.: because the perfect tense extends to a past period, which immediately precedes, or includes, the present time; and it cannot, therefore, apply to the time of *a week ago*, or to *last midsummer*.

"Charles has lately finished the reading of Henry's History of England:" it should be, "Charles *lately finished*," &c.; the word *lately* referring to a time completely past, without any allusion to the present time.

"They have resided in Italy, till a few months ago, for the benefit of their health:" it should be, "they *resided* in Italy," &c.

"This mode of expression has been formerly much admired:" it ought to be, "*was* formerly much admired."

"The business is not done here, in the manner in which it has been done, some years since in Germany: it should be, "in the manner in which it *was* done," &c.

"I will pay the vows which my lips have uttered, when I was in trouble:" it ought to be, "which my lips *uttered*," &c.

"I have, in my youth, trifled with health; and old age now prematurely assails me:" it should be, "In my youth, I *trifled* with health," &c.

The five examples last mentioned, are corrected on the same principle that the preceding examples are corrected.

"Charles is grown considerably since I have seen him the last time:" this sentence ought to be, "Charles *has* grown considerably, since I *saw* him the last time."

"Payment was, at length, made, but no reason assigned for its being so long postponed:" it should be, "for its *having been* so long postponed."

"He became so meek and submissive, that to be in the house as one of the hired servants, was now the utmost of his wishes:" it ought to be; "was *then* the utmost of his wishes."

"They were arrived an hour before we reached the city:" it ought to be, "They *had arrived*," &c.; because *arrived*, in this phrase, denotes an event not only past, but prior to the time referred to, by the words, "reached the city."

"The workmen will finish the business at midsummer." According to the meaning, it ought to be; "The workmen *will have finished*," &c.

"All the present family have been much indebted to their great and honourable ancestor:" it should be, "*are* much indebted."

"This curious piece of workmanship was preserved, and shown to strangers, for more than fifty years past:" it ought to be, "*has been preserved*, and *been shown*," &c.

"I had rather walk than ride;" it should be, "I *would* rather walk than ride."

"On the morrow, because he should have known the certainty, wherefore he was accused of the Jews, he loosed him:" it ought to be, "because he *would know*;" or rather, "*being willing to know*."

"The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I might receive my sight;" "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead:" in both these places, *may* would have been better than *might*.

"I feared that I should have lost the parcel, before I arrived at the city:" it should be, "I feared that *I should lose*," &c.

"It would have afforded me no satisfaction, if I could perform it:" it ought to be, "If I *could have performed* it;" or, "It *would afford* me no satisfaction, if I *could perform* it."

To preserve consistency in the time of verbs, and of words and phrases, we must recollect that, in the sub-

junctive mood, the present and the imperfect tenses often carry with them a future sense; and that the auxiliaries *should* and *would*, in the imperfect time, are used to express the present and future, as well as the past. See Section 5 of the 6th Chapter of Etymology; pages 124, 125.

1. With regard to verbs in the infinitive mood, the practice of many writers, and some even of our most respectable writers, appears to be erroneous. They seem not to advert to the true principles, which influence the different tenses of this mood. We shall produce some rules on the subject, which, we presume, will be found perspicuous and accurate. "All verbs expressive of hope, desire, intention, or command, must invariably be followed by the present, and not the perfect of the infinitive." "The last week I intended *to have written*," is a very common phrase; the infinitive being in the past time, as well as the verb which it follows. But it is evidently wrong: for how long soever it now is since I thought of writing, "to write" was then present to me; and must still be considered as present, when I bring back that time, and the thoughts of it. It ought therefore to be; "The last week, I intended *to write*."

The following sentence is properly and analogically expressed: "I found him better than I expected to find him." "Expected *to have found him*," is irreconcilable to grammar and to sense. Every person would perceive an error in this expression; "It is long since I commanded him *to have done* it:" yet, "expected to *have found*," is not better. It is as clear, that the *finding* must be posterior to the expectation, as that the *obedience* must be posterior to the command.

Some writers on grammar contend, that the sentence, "I intend to have written," is correct and grammatical; because it simply denotes, as they assert, the speaker's intention to be hereafter in possession of the finished action

of writing. But to this reasoning the following answers may be given: that the phrase, "to have written," is stated, in English grammars, as the established past tense of the infinitive mood; that it is as incontrovertibly the past tense of the infinitive in English, as *scripsisse* is the past tense of the infinitive in Latin; that no writers can be warranted in taking such liberties with the language, as to contradict its plainest rules, for the sake of supporting an hypothesis; that these writers might, on their own principles, and with equal propriety, contend, that the phrase, "I intend *having written*," is proper and grammatical; and that, by admitting such violations of established grammatical distinctions, confusion would be introduced, the language would be disorganized, and the most eccentric systems of grammar might be advanced, and plausibly supported.—In short, the phrase, "I intend to have written," appears to involve the following absurdity; "I intend to produce hereafter an action or event, which has been already completed."

As the verbs *to desire* and *to wish*, are nearly related, the young student may naturally suppose, from the rule just laid down, that the latter verb, like the former, must invariably be followed by the present of the infinitive. But if he reflect, that the act of *desiring* always refers to the future; and that the act of *wishing* refers sometimes to the past, as well as sometimes to the future; he will perceive the distinction between them, and that, consequently, the following modes of expression are strictly justifiable: "I wished *that I had written* sooner," "I wished *to have written* sooner:" and he will be perfectly satisfied, that the following phrases must be improper: "I desire that I had written sooner;" "I desire to have written sooner*."

---

*In the expression, "I hope that I have done my duty," there appears to be a considerable ellipsis. The sentence at large may very naturally be thus explained: "I hope it will appear, or, I hope to show, or, I hope it is evident, or, I hope you will believe, that I have done my duty." But

whether

Having considered and explained the special rule, respecting the government of verbs expressive of hope, desire, intention, or command, we proceed to state and elucidate the general rule, on the subject of verbs in the infinitive mood. It is founded on the authority of Harris, Lowth, Campbell, Pickbourn, &c.; and we think too, on the authority of reason and common sense. "When the action or event, signified by a verb in the infinitive mood, is *contemporary* or *future*, with respect to the verb to which it is chiefly related, the present of the infinitive is required: when it is *not* contemporary *nor* future, the perfect of the infinitive is necessary." To comprehend and apply this rule, the student has only to consider, whether the infinitive verb refers to a time antecedent, contemporary, or future, with regard to the governing or related verb. When this simple point is ascertained, there will be no doubt in his mind, respecting the form which the infinitive verb should have. A few examples may illustrate these positions. If I wish to signify, that I rejoiced at a particular time, in recollecting the sight of a friend, some time having intervened between the *seeing* and the *rejoicing*, I should express myself thus: "I rejoiced *to have seen* my friend." The *seeing*, in this case, was evidently antecedent to the *rejoicing;* and therefore the verb which expresses the former, must be in the perfect of the infinitive mood. The same meaning may be expressed in a different form: "I rejoiced *that I had seen* my friend;" or, "*in having seen* my friend:" and the stu-

---

whether the ellipsis be admitted or rejected, it is indubitable that the infinitive mood cannot be applied on this occasion: to say, "I hope to have done my duty," is harsh and incorrect. "I *hoped* that I *had done* my my duty;" that is, "I hoped he would believe, or, I hoped it was evident, that I had done my duty," is a correct and regular mode of expression. But it would not be proper, under any circumstances whatever, to say, "I *hoped to have done* my duty:" it should be, "I *hoped to do* my duty."

dent may, in general, try the propriety of a doubtful point of this nature, by converting the phrase into these two correspondent forms of expression. When it is convertible into both these equivalent phrases, its legitimacy must be admitted.—If, on the contrary, I wish to signify, that I rejoiced at the sight of my friend, that my joy and his presence were contemporary, I should say, "I rejoiced *to see* my friend;" or, in other words, "I rejoiced *in seeing* my friend." The correctness of this form of the infinitive may also, in most cases, be tried, by converting the phrase into other phrases of a similar import.

The subject may be still further illustrated, by additional examples. In the sentence which follows, the verb is with propriety put in the perfect tense of the infinitive mood: "It would have afforded me great pleasure, as often as I reflected upon it, *to have been* the messenger of such intelligence." As the message, in this instance, was antecedent to the pleasure, and not contemporary with it, the verb expressive of the message must denote that antecedence, by being in the perfect of the infinitive. If, on the contrary, the message and the pleasure were referred to as contemporary, the subsequent verb would, with equal propriety, have been put in the present of the infinitive: as, "It would have afforded me great pleasure, *to be* the messenger of such intelligence." In the former instance, the phrase in question is equivalent to these words; "*If I had been* the messenger;" in the latter instance, to this expression; "*Being* the messenger."

For the greater satisfaction of the reader, we shall present him with a variety of false constructions, under the general rule.

"This is a book which proves itself to be written by the person whose name it bears;" it ought to be, "which proves itself *to have been written*."

"To see him would have afforded me pleasure all my life;" it should be, "*To have seen* him, would have af-

forded," &c. or, "*To see* him *would afford* me pleasure," &c.

"The arguments were sufficient to have satisfied all who heard them;" "Providence did not permit the reign of Julian to have been long and prosperous:" they should be, "were sufficient *to satisfy*," &c. and, "*to be* long and prosperous."

"It was impossible for those men, by any diligence whatever, to have prevented this accident: every thing that men could have done, was done:" corrected thus; "*to prevent* this accident;" "every thing that men *could do*," &c.

"The respect shown to the candidate would have been greater, if it had been practicable to have afforded repeated opportunities to the freeholders, to have annexed their names to the address:" they should be, "if it had been practicable *to afford*," and, "*to annex* their names."

"From his biblical knowledge, he appears to study the Holy Scriptures with great attention:" it ought to be; "he appears *to have studied*," &c.

"I cannot excuse the remissness of those, whose business it should have been, as it certainly was their interest, to have interposed their good offices:" "There were two circumstances, which made it necessary for them to have lost no time:" "History painters would have found it difficult, to have invented such a species of beings." In these three examples, the phrases should have been, "*to interpose, to lose, to invent.*"

It is proper to inform the learner, that, in order to express the past time with the defective verb *ought*, the perfect of the infinitive must always be used: as, "He ought *to have done* it." When we use this verb, this is the only possible way to distinguish the past from the present.

In support of the positions advanced under this rule, we can produce the sentiments of the most eminent grammarians. There are, however, some writers on grammar, who strenuously maintain, that the governed verb in the

infinitive ought to be in the past tense, when the verb which governs it, is in the past time. Though this cannot be admitted, in the instances which are controverted under this rule, or in any instances of a similar nature, yet there can be no doubt that, in many cases, in which the thing referred to preceded the governing verb, it would be proper and allowable. We may say; "From a conversation I once had with him, he *appeared to have studied* Homer with great care and judgment." It would be proper also to say, "from his conversation, he *appears to have studied* Homer with great care and judgment;" "That unhappy man *is supposed to have died* by violence." These examples are not only consistent with our rule, but they confirm and illustrate it. It is the tense of the governing verb only, that marks what is called the absolute time; the tense of the verb governed, marks solely its relative time with respect to the other.

To assert, as some writers do, that verbs in the infinitive mood have no tenses, no relative distinctions of present, past, and future, is inconsistent with just grammatical views of the subject. That these verbs associate with verbs in all the tenses, is no proof of their having no peculiar time of their own. Whatever period the governing verb assumes, whether present, past, or future, the governed verb in the infinitive always respects that period, and its time is calculated from it. Thus, the time of the infinitive may be before, after, or the same as, the time of the governing verb, according as the thing signified by the infinitive is supposed to be before, after, or present with, the thing denoted by the governing verb. It is, therefore, with great propriety, that tenses are assigned to verbs of the infinitive mood. The point of time from which they are computed, is of no consequence; since present, past, and future, are completely applicable to them.

It may not be improper to observe, that though it is often correct to use the perfect of the infinitive after the

governing verb, yet there are particular cases, in which it would be better to give the expression a different form. Thus, instead of saying, "I wish to have written to him sooner," "I then wished to have written to him sooner," "He will one day wish to have written sooner;" it would be more perspicuous and forcible, as well as more agreeable to the practice of good writers, to say; "I wish that I had written to him sooner," "I then wished that I had written to him sooner," "He will one day wish that he had written sooner."

Should the justness of these strictures be admitted, the past infinitive would not be superseded, though some grammarians have supposed it would: there would still be numerous occasions for the use of it; as we may perceive by a few examples. "It would ever afterwards have been a source of pleasure, to have found him wise and virtuous." "To have deferred his repentance longer, would have disqualified him for repenting at all." "They will then see, that to have faithfully performed their duty, would have been their greatest consolation."

In relating things that were formerly expressed by another person, we often meet with modes of expression similar to the following:

"The travellers who lately came from the south of England, said that the harvest there *was* very abundant:" "I met Charles yesterday, who told me that he *is* very happy:" "The professor asserted, that a resolute adherence to truth *is* an indispensable duty:" "The preacher said very audibly, that whatever *was* useful, *was* good."

In referring to declarations of this nature, the present tense must be used, if the position is immutably the same at all times, or supposed to be so: as, "The bishop declared, that virtue *is* always advantageous:" not, "*was*

always advantageous." But if the assertion referred to something, that is not always the same, or supposed to be so, the past tense must be applied: as, "George said that he *was* very happy:" not, "*is* very happy."

The following sentences will fully exemplify, to the young grammarian, both the parts of this rule. "He declared to us, that he *was* afraid of no man; because conscious innocence *gives* firmness of mind." "He protested, that he *believed* what *was* said, because it *appeared* to him probable." "Charles asserted, that it *was* his opinion, that men always *succeed*, when they *use* precaution and pains." "The doctor declared to his audience, that if virtue *suffers* some pains, she *is* amply recompensed by the pleasures which attend her."

If this rule should not be completely applicable to every case which an ingenious critic may state, the author presumes that it will be found very generally useful.

The examples which have been adduced, to illustrate and strengthen the positions contained under the several parts of this *Thirteenth* rule of Syntax, will not, we hope, be deemed too numerous: they have been given so copiously, that the student may be the better informed and impressed, by surveying the subject at large, and in different points of view. The author has not advanced any instances, or corrections, which he does not think are pertinent and strictly defensible. But if some of them should be less obvious than others, and if a few of them should be gratuitously conceded to criticism, the candid reader will perceive, that there would still remain unimpeached, a number amply sufficient to confirm the different rules and positions. This observation may be properly extended to several other parts of the present work. A rule is not to be invalidated, because all the examples given under it, are not equally obvious, or even equally tenable.

RULE XIV.

Participles have the same government as the verbs from which they are derived: as, "I am weary with *hearing him*;" "She is *instructing us*;" "The tutor is *admonishing Charles**."

See vol. ii. p. 113.

1. Participles are sometimes governed by the article; for the present participle, with the definite article *the* before it, becomes a substantive, and must have the preposition *of* after it: as, "These are the rules of grammar, by the observing of which, you may avoid mistakes." It would not be proper to say, "by the observing which;" nor, "by observing of which;" but the phrase, without either article or preposition, would be right: as, "by observing which." The article *a* or *an*, has the same effect: as, "This was a betraying of the trust reposed in him."

This rule arises from the nature and idiom of our language, and from as plain a principle as any on which it is founded; namely, that a word which has the article before it, and the possessive preposition *of* after it, must be a noun: and, if a noun, it ought to follow the construction of a noun, and not to have the regimen of a verb. It is the participial termination of this sort of words that is apt to deceive us, and make us treat them as if they were of an amphibious species, partly nouns and partly verbs.

The following are a few examples of the violation of this rule. "He was sent to prepare the way by preach-

* Though the participle is not a part of speech distinct from the verb, yet as it forms a particular and striking part of the verb, and has some rules and observations which are peculiar to it, we think it is entitled to a separate, distinctive consideration.

ing of repentance;" it ought to be, "by *the* preaching of repentance;" or, "by preaching repentance." "By the continual mortifying our corrupt affections;" It should be, "by the continual mortifying *of*," or, "by continually mortifying our corrupt affections." "They laid out themselves towards *the* advancing and promoting the good of it;" "towards advancing and promoting the good." "It is *an* overvaluing ourselves, to reduce every thing to the narrow measure of our capacities;" "it is overvaluing ourselves," or, "*an* overvaluing *of* ourselves." "Keeping of one day in seven," &c. it ought to be, "*the* keeping *of* one day;" or, "keeping one day."

A phrase in which the article precedes the present participle and the possessive preposition follows it, will not, in every instance, convey the same meaning, as would be conveyed by the participle without the article and preposition. "He expressed the pleasure he had in the hearing of the philosopher," is capable of a different sense from, "He expressed the pleasure he had in hearing the philosopher." When, therefore, we wish, for the sake of harmony or variety, to substitute one of these phraseologies for the other, we should previously consider, whether they are perfectly similar in the sentiments they convey.

2. The same observations, which have been made respecting the effect of the article and participle, appear to be applicable to the pronoun and participle, when they are similarly associated: as, "Much depends on *their observing of* the rule, and error will be the consequence of *their neglecting of* it," instead of "*their observing* the rule, and *their neglecting* it." We shall perceive this more clearly, if we substitute a noun for the pronoun: as, "Much depends upon *Tyro's observing of* the rule," &c.; which is the same as, "Much depends on Tyro's obser-

vance of the rule." But, as this construction sounds rather harshly, it would, in general, be better to express the sentiment in the following, or some other form: "Much depends on the *rule's being observed;* and error will be the consequence of *its being neglected:*" or—"on observing the rule; and—of neglecting it." This remark may be applied to several other modes of expression to be found in this work; which, though they are contended for as strictly correct, are not always the most eligible, on account of their unpleasant sound. See pages 87, 115, 262—266, 307.

We sometimes meet with expressions like the following: "*In forming of* his sentences, he was very exact;" "*From calling of* names, he proceeded to blows." But this is incorrect language; for prepositions do not, like articles and pronouns, convert the participle itself into the nature of a substantive; as we have shown above in the phrase, "By observing which." And yet the participle with its adjuncts, may be considered as a substantive phrase in the objective case, governed by the preposition or verb, expressed or understood: as, "By *promising much, and performing but little,* we become despicable." "He studied to avoid *expressing himself too severely.*"

3. As the perfect participle and the imperfect tense, are sometimes different in their form, care must be taken that they be not indiscriminately used. It is frequently said, "He begun," for "he began;" "he run," for "he ran;" "He drunk," for "he drank;" the participle being here used instead of the imperfect tense: and much more frequently the imperfect tense instead of the participle: as, "I had wrote," for "I had written:" "I was chose," for "I was chosen;" "I have eat," for "I have eaten." "His words were interwove with sighs;" "were *interwoven.*" "He would have spoke;" "*spoken.*" "He hath bore witness to his faithful servant;" "*borne.*"

"By this means he over-run his guide;" "*over-ran.*" "The sun has rose;" "*risen.*" "His constitution has been greatly shook, but his mind is too strong to be shook by such causes;" "*shaken*," in both places. "They were verses wrote on glass;" "*written.*" "Philosophers have often mistook the source of true happiness:" it ought to be "*mistaken.*"

The participle ending in *ed* is often improperly contracted, by changing *ed* into *t*: as, "In good behaviour, he is not *surpast* by any pupil of the school." "She was much distrest." They ought to be, "*surpassed*," "*distressed.*"

When a substantive is put absolutely, and does not agree with the following verb, it remains independent on the participle, and is called the *case absolute*, or the *nominative absolute*: as, "The painter being entirely confined to that part of time he has chosen, the picture comprises but very few incidents." Here, the *painter* agrees with no verb, as the verb *comprises*, which follows, agrees with *picture.* But when the substantive preceding the participle agrees with the subsequent verb, it loses its absoluteness, and is like every other nominative: as, "The painter, being entirely confined to that part of time which he has chosen, cannot exhibit various stages of the same action." In this sentence we see that *the painter* governs, or agrees with, the verb *can*, as its nominative case. In the following sentence, a still different construction takes place: "The painter's being entirely confined to that part of time which he has chosen, deprives him of the power of exhibiting various stages of the same action." In this sentence, if we inquire for the nominative case, by asking, what deprives the painter of the power of exhibiting various stages of the same action, we shall find it to be, the confinement of the painter to that part of time which

he has chosen; and this *state* of things belonging to the painter governs it in the possessive case, and forms the compound nominative to the verb *deprives*.

In the sentence, "What think you of my horse's running to-day?" it is implied that the horse did actually run. If it is said, "What think you of my horse running to-day?" it is intended to ask, whether it be proper for my horse to run to-day. This distinction, though frequently disregarded, deserves attention; for it is obvious, that ambiguity may arise, from using the latter only of these phraseologies, to express both meanings.

The active participle is frequently introduced without an obvious reference to any noun or pronoun: as, "Generally *speaking*, his conduct was very honourable:" "*Granting* this to be true, what is to be inferred from it?" "It is scarcely possible to act otherwise, *considering* the frailty of human nature." In these sentences, there is no noun expressed or implied, to which *speaking*, *granting*, and *considering*, can be referred. The most natural construction seems to be, that a pronoun is to be understood: as, "*We* considering the frailty of human nature," &c.; "*I* granting this to be true," &c.

The word *the*, before the active participle, in the following sentences, and in all others of a similar construction, is improper, and should be omitted: "This style may be more properly called *the* talking upon paper than writing:" "*The* advising, or *the* attempting, to excite such disturbances, is unlawful:" "*The* taking from another what is his, without his knowledge or allowance, is called stealing." They should be; "May be called talking upon paper;" "Advising or attempting to excite disturbances;" "Taking from another what is his," &c.

In some of these sentences, the infinitive mood might very properly be adopted: as, "To advise or attempt;" "To take from another," &c.

RULE XV.

ADVERBS, though they have no government of case, tense, &c. require an appropriate situation in the sentence, viz. for the most part, before adjectives, after verbs active or neuter, and frequently between the auxiliary and the verb: as, "He made a *very sensible* discourse; he *spoke unaffectedly* and *forcibly*; and *was attentively heard* by the whole assembly."

See vol. ii. p. 117.

A FEW instances of erroneous positions of adverbs may serve to illustrate the rule. "He must not expect to find study agreeable always;" "*always* agreeable." "We always find them ready when we want them;" "we find them *always* ready," &c. "Dissertations on the prophecies which have remarkably been fulfilled;" "which have been *remarkably*." "Instead of looking contemptuously down on the crooked in mind or in body, we should look up thankfully to God, who hath made us better;" "instead of looking down *contemptuously*, &c. we should *thankfully look up*," &c. "If thou art blessed naturally with a good memory, continually exercise it;" "*naturally blessed*," &c. "exercise it *continually*."

Sometimes the adverb is placed with propriety before the verb, or at some distance after it; sometimes between the two auxiliaries; and sometimes after them both; as in the following examples. "Vice *always* creeps by degrees, and *insensibly* twines around us those concealed fetters, by which we are at last *completely* bound." "He encouraged the English Barons to carry their opposition *farther*." They compelled him to declare that he would abjure the realm *for ever*;" instead of, "to carry farther their opposition;" and "to abjure for ever the realm."

"He has *generally* been reckoned an honest man:" "The book may *always* be had at such a place;" in preference to "has been generally;" and "may be always." "These rules will be *clearly* understood, after they have been *diligently* studied," are preferable to, "These rules will *clearly* be understood, after they have *diligently* been studied."

When adverbs are emphatical, they may introduce a sentence, and be separated from the word to which they belong: as, "*How completely* this most amiable of human virtues, *had taken possession* of his soul!" This position of the adverb is most frequent in interrogative and exclamatory phrases.

From the preceding remarks and examples, it appears that no exact and determinate rule can be given for the placing of adverbs, on all occasions. The general rule may be of considerable use: but the easy flow and perspicuity of the phrase, are the things which ought to be chiefly regarded.

The adverb *there* is often used as an expletive, or as a word that adds nothing to the sense: in which case it precedes the verb and the nominative noun: as, "There is a person at the door;" "There are some thieves in the house;" which would be as well, or better, expressed by saying, "A person is at the door;" "Some thieves are in the house." Sometimes, it is made use of to give a small degree of emphasis to the sentence: as, "*There* was a man sent from God, whose name was John." When it is applied in its strict sense, it principally follows the verb and the nominative case: as, "The man stands *there*."

1. The adverb *never* generally precedes the verb: as, "I never was there;" "He never comes at a proper time." When an auxiliary is used, it is placed indifferently, either before or after this adverb: as, "He was

never seen (or never was seen) to laugh from that time." *Never* seems to be improperly used in the following passages. "Ask me never so much dowry and gift." "If I make my hands never so clean." "Charm he never so wisely." The word "*ever*" would be more suitable to the sense.—*Ever* is sometimes improperly used for *never*: as, "I seldom or ever see him now." It should be, "I seldom or *never*;" the speaker intending to say, "that rarely, or rather at no time, does he see him now;" not "rarely," or, "at any time."

2. In imitation of the French idiom, the adverb of place *where*, is often used instead of the pronoun relative and a preposition. "They framed a protestation, *where* they repeated all their former claims;" i. e. "*in which* they repeated." "The king was still determined to run forwards, in the same course *where* he was already, by his precipitate career, too fatally advanced;" i. e. *in which* he was." But it would be better to avoid this mode of expression.

The adverbs *hence*, *thence*, and *whence*, imply a preposition; for they signify, "from this place, from that place, from what place." It seems, therefore, strictly speaking, to be improper to join a preposition with them, because it is superfluous: as, "This is the leviathan, from whence the wits of our age are said to borrow their weapons;" "an ancient author prophesies from hence." But the origin of these words is little attended to, and the preposition *from* is so often used in construction with them, that the omission of it, in many cases, would seem stiff, and be disagreeable.

The adverbs *here*, *there*, *where*, are often improperly applied to verbs signifying motion, instead of the adverbs *hither*, *thither*, *whither*: as, "He came *here* hastily;" "They rode *there* with speed." They should be, "He came *hither*;" "They rode *thither*," &c.

3. We have some examples of adverbs being used for substantives: "In 1687, he erected it into a community of regulars, since *when*, it has begun to increase in those countries as a religious order;" i. e. "since *which time*." "A little while and I shall not see you;" i. e. "a *short time*." "It is worth their while;" i. e. "it deserves their time and pains." But this mode of expression rather suits familiar than grave style. The same may be said of the phrase, "To do a thing *anyhow;*" i. e. "in any manner;" or, "*somehow;*" i. e. "in some manner." "Somehow, worthy as these people are, they are under the influence of prejudice."

Such expressions as the following, though not destitute of authority, are very inelegant, and do not suit the idiom of our language:" "The *then* ministry," for, "the ministry of that time;" "The above discourse," for "the preceding discourse."

RULE XVI.

Two negatives, in English, destroy one another, or are equivalent to an affirmative: as, "*Nor* did they *not* perceive him;" that is, "they did perceive him." "His language, though inelegant, is *not ungrammatical*," that is, "it is grammatical."

See vol. ii. p. 119.

It is better to express an affirmation, by a regular affirmative, than by two separate negatives, as in the former sentence: but when one of the negatives is joined to another word, as in the latter sentence, the two negatives form a pleasing and delicate variety of expression.

Some writers have improperly employed two negatives instead of one: as in the following instances: "I never did repent of doing good, nor shall not now;" "*nor shall*

I now." "Never no imitator grew up to his author:" "*never did any*," &c. "I cannot by no means allow him what his argument must prove;" "I cannot by *any* means," &c. or, "I *can by no means*." "Nor let no comforter approach me;" "nor let *any* comforter," &c. "Nor is danger ever apprehended in such a government, no more than we commonly apprehend danger from thunder or earthquakes:" it should be, "*any more*." "Ariosto, Tasso, Galileo, *no more* than Raphael, were *not* born in republics." "Neither Ariosto, Tasso, nor Galileo, any more than Raphael, was born in a republic."

RULE XVII.

PREPOSITIONS govern the objective case: as, "I have heard a good character *of her*;" "*From him* that is needy turn not away;" "A word to the wise is sufficient *for them*;" "We may be good and happy *without riches*."

See vol. ii. p. 120.

THE following are examples of the nominative case being used instead of the objective. "Who servest thou under?" "Who do you speak to?" "We are still much at a loss who civil power belongs to?" "Who do you ask for?" "Associate not with those who none can speak well of." In all these places it ought to be "*whom*." See *Note* 1.

The prepositions *to* and *for* are often understood, chiefly before the pronouns: as, "Give me the book;" "Get me some paper;" that is, "*to* me; *for* me." "Wo is me;" i. e. "*to* me." "He was banished England;" i. e. "*from* England."

1. The preposition is often separated from the relative which it governs: as, "Whom will you give it to?" in-

stead of, "*To whom* will you give it?" "He is an author whom I am much delighted with;" "The world is too polite to shock authors with a truth, which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of." This is an idiom to which our language is strongly inclined; it prevails in common conversation, and suits very well with the familiar style in writing: but the placing of the preposition before the relative, is more graceful, as well as more perspicuous, and agrees much better with the solemn and elevated style.

2. Some writers separate the preposition from the noun or pronoun which it governs, in order to connect different prepositions with the same word: as, "To suppose the zodiac and planets to be efficient *of*, and antecedent *to*, themselves." This construction, whether in the familiar or the solemn style, is always inelegant, and should generally be avoided. In forms of law, and the like, where fulness and exactness of expression must take place of every other consideration, it may be admitted.

3. Different relations, and different senses, must be expressed by different prepositions, though in conjunction with the same verb or adjective. Thus we say, "to converse *with* a person, *upon* a subject, *in* a house," &c. We also say, "We are disappointed *of* a thing," when we cannot get it, "and disappointed *in* it," when we have it, and find it does not answer our expectations. But two different prepositions must be improper in the same construction, and in the same sentence: as, "The combat *between* thirty French *against* twenty English."

In some cases it is difficult to say, to which of two prepositions the preference is to be given, as both are used promiscuously, and custom has not decided in favour of either of them. We say, "Expert at," and "expert in-

a thing." "Expert at finding a remedy for his mistakes;" "Expert in deception."

When prepositions are subjoined to nouns, they are generally the same that are subjoined to the verbs from which the nouns are derived: as, "A compliance *with*," "to comply *with*;" "A disposition *to* tyranny," "disposed *to* tyrannise."

Dr. Priestley observes, that many writers affect to subjoin to any word, the preposition with which it is compounded, or the idea of which it implies; in order to point out the relation of the words, in a more distinct and definite manner, and to avoid the more indeterminate prepositions *of* and *to:* but general practice, and the idiom of the English tongue, seem to oppose the innovation. Thus many writers say, "Averse *from* a thing;" "The abhorrence *against* all other sects." But other writers use, "Averse *to* it;" which seems more truly English: "Averse *to* any advice." *Swift.* An attention to the latent metaphor may be pleaded in favour of the former example; and this is a rule of general use, in directing what prepositions to subjoin to a word. Thus we say, "devolve *upon* a thing;" "founded *on* natural resemblance." But this rule would sometimes mislead us, particularly where the figure has become nearly evanescent. Thus, we should naturally expect, that the word *depend* would require *from* after it: but custom obliges us to say, "depend upon," as well as, "insist upon a thing." Were we to use the same word where the figure is manifest, we could apply to it no other preposition than *from:* as, "The cage depends *from* the roof of the building:" and yet this mode of expression is inadmissible.

"The words *averse* and *aversion* (says Dr. Campbell) are more properly construed with *to* than with *from.* The examples in favour of the latter preposition, are beyond comparison outnumbered by those in favour of the former. The argument from etymology is here of no value, being

taken from the use of another language. If, by the same rule, we were to regulate all nouns and verbs of Latin original, our present syntax would be overturned. It is more conformable to English analogy with *to:* the words *dislike* and *hatred*, nearly synonymous, are thus construed."

4. As an accurate and appropriate use of the preposition is of great importance, we shall select a considerable number of examples of impropriety, in the application of this part of speech.

First—With respect to the preposition OF.

"He is resolved of going to the Persian court;" "*on* going," &c.

"He was totally dependent of the Papal crown;" "*on* the Papal," &c.

"To call of a person," and "to wait of him;" "*on* a person," &c.

"He was eager of recommending it to his fellow citizens;" "*in* recommending," &c.

Of is sometimes omitted, and sometimes inserted, after *worthy:* as, "It is worthy observation," or, "of observation."

But it would have been better omitted in the following sentences. "The emulation, who should serve their country best, no longer subsists among them, but *of* who should obtain the most lucrative command."

"The rain hath been falling *of* a long time;" "falling a long time."

"It is situation chiefly which decides of the fortune and characters of men;" "decides the fortune," or, "*concerning* the fortune."

"He found the greatest difficulty of writing;" "*in* writing."

"It might have given me a greater taste of its antiquities." A taste *of* a thing implies actual enjoyment of it; but a taste *for* it, implies only a capacity of enjoyment.

"This had a much greater share of inciting him, than any regard after his father's commands;" "share *in* inciting," and "regard *to* his father's," &c.

Second—With respect to the prepositions TO and FOR.

"You have bestowed your favours to the most deserving persons;" "*upon* the most deserving," &c.

"He accused the ministers for betraying the Dutch;" "*of* having betrayed."

"His abhorrence to that superstitious figure;" "*of* that," &c.

"A great change to the better;" "*for* the better."

"Your prejudice to my cause;" "*against*."

"The English were very different people then to what they are at present;" "*from* what," &c.

"In compliance to the declaration;" "*with*," &c.

"It is more than they thought for;" "thought *of*."

"There is no need for it;" "*of* it."

For is superfluous in the phrase, "More than he knows *for*."

"No discouragement for the authors to proceed;" "*to* the authors," &c.

"It was perfectly in compliance to some persons;" "*with* some persons."

"The wisest princes need not think it any diminution to their greatness, or derogation to their sufficiency, to rely upon counsel;" "diminution *of*," and "derogation *from*."

Third—With respect to the prepositions WITH and UPON.

"Reconciling himself with the king."

"Those things which have the greatest resemblance with each other, frequently differ the most."

"That such rejection should be consonant with our common nature." "Conformable with," &c.

"The history of Peter is agreeable with the sacred texts."

In all the above instances, it should be, "*to*," instead of "*with*."

"It is a use that perhaps I should not have thought on;" "thought *of*."

"A greater quantity may be taken from the heap, without making any sensible alteration upon it;" "*in* it."

"Intrusted to persons on whom the parliament could confide;" "*in* whom."

"He was made much on at Argos;" "much *of*."

"If policy can prevail upon force;" "*over* force."

"I do likewise dissent with the examiner;" "*from*."

Fourth—With respect to the prepositions IN, FROM, &c.

"They should be informed in some parts of his character;" "*about*," or "*concerning*."

"Upon such occasions as fell into their cognizance;" "*under*."

"That variety of factions into which we are still engaged;" "*in* which."

"To restore myself into the favour;" "*to* the favour."

"Could he have profited from repeated experiences;" "*by*." *From* seems to be superfluous after *forbear:* as, "He could not forbear from appointing the pope," &c.

"A strict observance after times and fashions;" "*of* times."

"The character which we may now value ourselves by drawing;" "*upon* drawing."

"Neither of them shall make me swerve out of the path;" "*from* the path."

"Ye blind guides, which strain *at* a gnat, and swallow a camel;" it ought to be, "which strain *out* a gnat, or, take a gnat out of the liquor by straining it." The impropriety of the preposition has wholly destroyed the meaning of the phrase

The verb *to found*, when used literally, is more properly followed by the preposition *on:* as, "The house was *founded on* a rock." But in the metaphorical application, it is often better with *in;* as in this sentence, "They maintained, that dominion is *founded in* grace." Both the sentences would be badly expressed, if these prepositions were transposed; though there are perhaps cases in which either of them would be good.

The preposition *among* generally implies a number of things. It cannot be properly used in conjunction with the word *every*, which is in the singular number: as, "Which is found among every species of liberty;" "The opinion seems to gain ground among every body."

5. The preposition *to* is made use of before nouns of place, when they follow verbs and participles of motion: as, "I went *to* London;" "I am going *to* town." But the preposition *at* is generally used after the neuter verb *to be:* as, "I have been *at* London;" "I was *at* the place appointed;" "I shall be *at* Paris." We likewise say: "He touched, arrived *at* any place." The preposition *in* is set before countries, cities, and large towns: as, "He lives in France, in London, or in Birmingham." But before villages, single houses, and cities which are in distant countries, *at* is used: as, "He lives at Hackney;" "He resides at Montpelier."

It is a matter of indifference with respect to the pronoun *one another*, whether the preposition *of* be placed between the two parts of it, or before them both. We may say, "They were jealous of one another;" or, "They were jealous one of another;" but perhaps the former is better.

Participles are frequently used as prepositions: as, excepting, respecting, touching, concerning, according. "They were all in fault *except* or *excepting* him."

RULE XVIII.

CONJUNCTIONS connect the same moods and tenses of verbs, and cases of nouns and pronouns: as, "Candour is *to be approved and practised*;" "If thou sincerely *desire*, and earnestly *pursue* virtue, she *will* assuredly *be found* by thee, *and prove* a rich reward;" "The master taught *her and me* to write;" "*He and she* were school-fellows*."

See vol. ii. p. 124.

A FEW examples of inaccuracy respecting this rule, may further display its utility. "If he prefer a virtuous life, and is sincere in his professions, he will succeed;" "if he *prefers*." "To deride the miseries of the unhappy, is inhuman; and wanting compassion towards them, is unchristian;" "and *to want* compassion." "The parliament addressed the king, and has been prorogued the same day;" "and *was* prorogued." "His wealth and him bid adieu to each other;" "and *he*." "He entreated us, my comrade and I, to live harmoniously;" "comrade and *me*." "My sister and her were on good terms;" "and *she*." "We often overlook the blessings which are in our possession, and are searching after those which are out of our reach:" it ought to be, "and *search* after."

1. Conjunctions are, indeed, frequently made to connect different moods and tenses of verbs: but in these instances the nominative must generally, if not always, be repeated, which is not necessary, though it may be done, under the construction to which the rule refers. We may say, "He *lives* temperately, *and* he should live temperately;"

* This rule refers only to nouns and pronouns, which have the same bearing or relation, with regard to other parts of the sentence.

"He *has done* much for them, though *he might have done* more;" "*They did* all that was in their power to serve him, and *they should not be reproached* for not doing more;" "*He* cheerfully *supports* his distressed friend, and *he will* certainly be commended for it;" "They *have rewarded* him liberally, and *they could not do* otherwise;" "She *was* proud, though she *is* now humble:" but it is obvious, that the nominative, in such cases, ought to be repeated; and that, by this means, the latter members of these sentences are rendered not so strictly dependent on the preceding, as those are which come under the rule. When, in the progress of a sentence, we pass from the affirmative to the negative form, or from the negative to the affirmative, the subject or nominative is mostly, if not invariably, resumed: as, "He may return, but he will not continue here." "He is rich, but he is not respectable." "He is not rich, but he is respectable." "Though she is high-born, beautiful, and accomplished, yet *she* is mortal, and, occasionally, *she* ought to be admonished of her condition." There appears to be, in general, equal reason for repeating the nominative, and resuming the subject, when the course of the sentence is diverted by a change of the mood or tense. The following sentences may therefore be improved. "Anger glances into the breast of a wise man, but will rest only in the bosom of fools;" "but *rests* only;" or, "but *it will* rest only." "Virtue is praised by many, and would be desired also, if her worth were really known;" "and *she* would." "The world begins to recede, and will soon disappear;" "and *it* will."

If criticism should be able to produce some exceptions to this rule, we presume it will, nevertheless, be found a useful and proper general direction. Rules are not to be subverted because they admit of exceptions: *exceptio probat regulam.*

RULE XIX.

Some conjunctions require the indicative, some the subjunctive mood, after them. It is a general rule, that when something contingent or doubtful is implied, the subjunctive ought to be used: as, "*If I were* to write, he would not regard it;" "He will not be pardoned, *unless he repent*."

Conjunctions that are of a positive and absolute nature, require the indicative mood. "*As* virtue *advances, so* vice *recedes*;" "He is healthy, *because* he *is* temperate."

See vol. ii. p. 126.

The conjunctions, *if*, *though*, *unless*, *except*, *whether*, &c. generally require the subjunctive mood after them: as, "*If* thou *be* afflicted, repine not;" "*Though* he *slay* me, yet will I trust in him;" "He cannot be clean, *unless* he *wash* himself;" "No power, *except* it *were* given from above;" "*Whether* it *were* I or they, so we preach." But even these conjunctions, when the sentence does not imply doubt, admit of the indicative: as, "*Though* he *is* poor, he is contented."

The following example may, in some measure, serve to illustrate the distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative moods; "*Though* he *were* divinely inspired, and spoke therefore as the oracles of God, with supreme authority; *though* he *were* endued with supernatural powers, and could, therefore, have confirmed the truth of what he uttered, by miracles: yet, in compliance with the way in which human nature and reasonable creatures are usually wrought upon, he reasoned." That our Saviour was divinely inspired, and endued with supernatural powers, are positions that are here taken for granted, as not admitting the least doubt; they would

therefore have been better expressed in the indicative mood: "*Though* he *was* divinely inspired; *though* he *was* endued with supernatural powers." The subjunctive is used in the like improper manner, in the following example: "*Though* he *were* a son, yet learned he obedience, by the things which he suffered." But, in a similar passage, the indicative, with great propriety, is employed to the same purpose: "*Though* he *was* rich, yet for your sakes he became poor."

1. *Lest* and *that*, annexed to a command preceding, necessarily require the subjunctive mood: as, "Love not sleep, *lest* thou *come* to poverty;" "Reprove not a scorner, *lest* he *hate* thee;" "Take heed *that* thou *speak* not to Jacob."

If with *but* following it, when futurity is denoted, requires the subjunctive mood: as, "*If* he *do but* touch the hills, they shall smoke;" "*If* he *be but* discreet, he will succeed." But the indicative ought to be used, on this occasion, when future time is not signified: as, "*If*, in this expression, he *does but* jest, no offence should be taken;" "*If* she *is but* sincere, I am happy." The same distinction applies to the following forms of expression: "If he *do* submit, it will be from necessity;" "Though he *does* submit, he is not convinced;" "If thou *do* not reward this service, he will be discouraged;" "If thou *dost* heartily forgive him, endeavour to forget the offence."

2. In the following instances, the conjunction *that*, expressed or understood, seems to be improperly accompanied with the subjunctive mood. "So much she dreaded his tyranny, *that* the fate of her friend she *dare* not lament." "He reasoned so artfully that his friends would listen, and think [*that*] he *were* not wrong."

3. The same conjunction governing both the indicative and the subjunctive moods, in the same sentence, and in the same circumstances, seems to be a great impropriety; as in these instances. "*If* there *be* but one body of legislators, it is no better than a tyranny: *if* there *are* only two, there will want a casting voice." "*If* a man *have* a hundred sheep, and one of them *is* gone astray," &c.

4. Almost all the irregularities, in the construction of any language, have arisen from the ellipsis of some words, which were originally inserted in the sentence, and made it regular; and it is probable, that this has been generally the case with respect to the conjunctive form of words, now in use; which will appear from the following examples: "We shall overtake him though he *run*;" that is, "though he *should* run;" "Unless he *act* prudently, he will not accomplish his purpose;" that is, "unless he *shall* act prudently." "If he *succeed* and *obtain* his end, he will not be the happier for it;" that is, "If he *should* succeed, and *should* obtain his end." These remarks and examples are designed to show the original of many of our present conjunctive forms of expression; and to enable the student to examine the propriety of using them, by tracing the words in question to their proper origin and ancient connexions. But it is necessary to be more particular on this subject, and therefore we shall add a few observations respecting it.

That part of the verb which grammarians call the present tense of the subjunctive mood, has a future signification. This is effected by varying the terminations of the second and third persons singular of the indicative; as will be evident from the following examples: "If thou *prosper*, thou shouldst be thankful;" "Unless he *study* more closely, he will never be learned." Some writers however would express these sentiments without those

variations; "If thou *prosperest*," &c. "Unless he *studies*," &c.: and as there is great diversity of practice in this point, it is proper to offer the learners a few remarks, to assist them in distinguishing the right application of these different forms of expression. It may be considered as a rule, that the changes of termination are necessary, when these two circumstances concur: 1st, When the subject is of a dubious and contingent nature; and 2d, When the verb has a reference to future time. In the following sentences, both these circumstances will be found to unite: "If thou *injure* another, thou wilt hurt thyself;" "He has a hard heart; and if he *continue* impenitent, he must suffer;" "He will maintain his principles, though he *lose* his estate;" "Whether he *succeed* or not, his intention is laudable;" "If he *be* not prosperous, he will not repine;" "If a man *smite* his servant, and he *die*," &c. *Exodus* xxi. 20. In all these examples, the things signified by the verbs are uncertain, and refer to future time. But in the instances which follow, future time is not referred to; and therefore a different construction takes place: "If thou *livest* virtuously, thou art happy;" "Unless he *means* what he says, he is doubly faithless;" "If he *allows* the excellence of virtue, he does not regard her precepts;" "Though he *seems* to be simple and artless, he has deceived us;" "Whether virtue *is* better than rank or wealth, admits not of any dispute;" "If thou *believest* with all thy heart, thou mayst," &c. *Acts* viii. 37.—There are many sentences, introduced by conjunctions, in which neither contingency nor futurity is denoted: as, "Though he *excels* her in knowledge, she far exceeds him in virtue." "I have no doubt of his principles: but if he *believes* the truths of religion, he does not act according to them."

That both the circumstances of contingency and futurity are necessary, as tests of the propriety of altering the terminations, will be evident, by inspecting the following

examples; which show that there are instances in which neither of the circumstances alone implies the other. In the three examples following, contingency is denoted, but not futurity. "If he *thinks* as he speaks, he may safely be trusted." "If he *is* now diposed to it, I will perform the operation." "He acts uprightly, unless he *deceives* me." In the following sentences, futurity is signified, but not contingency. "As soon as the sun *sets*, it will be cooler." "As the autumn *advances*, these birds will gradually emigrate."

It appears, from the tenor of the examples adduced, that the rules abovementioned may be extended to assert, that in cases wherein contingency and futurity do not concur, it is not proper to turn the verb from its signification of present time, nor to vary its form or termination. The verb would then be in the indicative mood, whatever conjunctions might attend it.—If these rules which seem to form the true distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative moods in this tense, were adopted and established in practice, we should have, on this point, a principle of decision simple and precise, and readily applicable to every case that might occur. It will, doubtless, sometimes happen, that, on this occasion, as well as on many other occasions, a strict adherence to grammatical rules, would render the language stiff and formal: but when cases of this sort occur, it is better to give the expression a different turn, than to violate grammar for the sake of ease, or even of elegance. See *Rule* 14. *Note* 2. p. 286.

5. On the form of the auxiliaries in the compound tenses of the subjunctive mood, it seems proper to make a few observations. Some writers express themselves in the perfect tense as follows: "If thou *have* determined, we must submit:" "Unless he *have* consented, the writing will be void:" but we believe that few authors of critical sagacity write in this manner. The proper form seems to

be, "If thou *hast* determined; unless he *has* consented," &c. conformably to what we generally meet with in the Bible: "I have surnamed thee, though thou *hast* not known me." *Isaiah* xlv. 4, 5. "What is the hope of the hypocrite, though he *hath* gained," &c. *Job* xxvii. 8. See also *Acts* xxviii. 4.

6. In the pluperfect and future tenses, we sometimes meet with such expressions as these: "If thou *had* applied thyself diligently, thou wouldst have reaped the advantage;" "Unless thou *shall* speak the whole truth, we cannot determine;" "It thou *will* undertake the business, there is little doubt of success." This mode of expressing the auxiliaries does not appear to be warranted by the general practice of correct writers. They should be *hadst, shalt,* and *wilt*: and we find them used in this form, in the sacred Scriptures.

"If thou *hadst* known," &c. *Luke* xix. 47. "If thou *hadst* been here," &c. *John* xi. 21. "If thou *wilt*, thou canst make me clean." *Matt.* viii. 2. See also, 2 *Sam.* ii. 27. *Matt.* xvii. 4.

7. The second person singular of the imperfect tense in the subjunctive mood, is also very frequently varied in its termination: as, "If thou *loved* him truly, thou wouldst obey him;" "Though thou *did* conform, thou hast gained nothing by it." This variation, however, appears to be improper. Our present version of the Scriptures, which we again refer to, as a good grammatical authority in points of this nature, decides against it. "If thou *knewest* the gift," &c. *John* iv. 10. "If thou *didst* receive it, why dost thou glory?" &c. 1 *Cor.* iv. 7. See also *Dan.* v. 22. But it is proper to remark, that the form of the verb *to be*, when used subjunctively in the imperfect tense, is indeed very considerably and properly varied from that which it has in the imperfect of the indi-

cative mood: as the learner will perceive by turning to the conjugation of that verb*.

8. It may not be superfluous, also to observe, that the auxiliaries of the potential mood, when applied to the subjunctive, do not change the termination of the second person singular. We properly say, "If thou *mayst* or *canst* go;" "Though thou *mightst* live;" "Unless thou *couldst* read;" "If thou *wouldst* learn;" and not, "If thou *may* or *can* go;" &c. It is sufficient, on this point, to adduce the authorities of Johnson and Lowth: "If thou *shouldst* go;" *Johnson.* "If thou *mayst, mightst,* or *couldst* love;" *Lowth.* Some authors think, that when *that* expresses the motive or end, the termination of these auxiliaries should be varied: as, "I advise thee, *that* thou *may* beware;" "He checked thee, *that* thou *should* not presume:" but there does not appear to be any ground for this exception. If the expression of "condition, doubt, contingency," &c. does not warrant a change in the form of these auxiliaries, why should they have it, when a motive or end is expressed? The translators of the Scriptures do not appear to have made the distinction contended for. "Thou buildest the wall, *that* thou *mayst* be their king," *Neh.* vi. 6. "There is forgiveness with thee, *that* thou *mayst* be feared." *Psalms* cxxx. 4.

From the preceding observations under this rule, it appears, that with respect to what is termed the present tense of any verb, when the circumstances of contingency and futurity concur, it is proper to vary the terminations of the second and third persons singular: that without the concurrence of those circumstances, the terminations

---

* See observations on the manner of conjugating the subjunctive mood, at pages 136. 151—154.

should not be altered; and that the verb and the auxiliaries of the three past tenses, and the auxiliaries of the first future, undergo no alterations whatever: except the *imperfect* of the verb *to be*, which, in cases denoting contingency, is varied in all the persons of the singular number. *See p. 135. The second Note.*

After perusing what has been advanced on this subject, it will be natural for the student to inquire, what is the extent of the subjunctive mood? Some grammarians think it extends only to what is called the present tense of verbs generally, under the circumstances of contingency and futurity; and to the imperfect tense of the verb *to be*, when it denotes contingency &c.: because in these tenses only, the form of the verb admits of variation; and they suppose that it is variation merely which constitutes the distinction of moods. It is the opinion of other grammarians, (in which opinion we concur,) that, besides the two cases just mentioned, all verbs in the three past, and the two future tenses, are in the subjunctive mood, when they denote contingency or uncertainty, though they have not any change of termination; and that, when contingency is not signified, the verb, through all these five tenses, belongs to the indicative mood, whatever conjunction may attend it. They think, that the definition and nature of the subjunctive mood, have no reference to change of termination, but that they refer merely to the manner of the being, action, or passion, signified by the verb; and that the subjunctive mood may as properly exist without a variation of the verb, as the infinitive mood, which has no terminations different from those of the indicative. The decision of this point may not, by some grammarians, be thought of much consequence. But the rules which ascertain the propriety of varying, or not varying, the terminations of the verb, will certainly be deemed important. These rules may be well observed, without a

uniformity of sentiment respecting the nature and limits of the subjunctive mood. For further remarks on the subject, see pages 117—119. 128—131. 152—154. 159—161.*

---

* We have stated, for the student's information, the different opinions of grammarians, respecting the English Subjunctive Mood: *First*, that which supposes there is no such mood in our language; *Secondly*, that which extends it no farther than the variations of the verb extend; *Thirdly*, that which we have adopted, and explained at large; and which, in general, corresponds with the views of the most approved writers on English Grammar. We may add a *Fourth* opinion; which appears to possess, at least, much plausibility. This opinion admits the arrangement we have given, with one variation, namely, that of assigning to the first tense of the subjunctive, two forms: 1st, that which simply denotes contingency: as, "If he *desires* it, I will perform the operation;" that is, "If he *now* desires it:" 2dly, that which denotes both contingency and futurity: as, "If he *desire* it, I will perform the operation;" that is, "If he should *hereafter* desire it." This last theory of the subjunctive mood, claims the merit of rendering the whole system of the moods consistent and regular; of being more conformable than any other, to the definition of the subjunctive; and of not referring to the indicative mood forms of expression, which ill accord with its simplicity and nature. Perhaps this theory will bear a strict examination.

Some critics assert, that as the phrase, "If he *desire* it," has a future signification, it should be considered and arranged as a future tense. But as all our grammarians concur in classing this form of expression under the present tense; as it nearly resembles the form of this tense, and appears to be closely connected with it; and as no possible inconvenience can arise from adhering to general usage, when the subject is well explained; we think that the present arrangement is perfectly justifiable. There is certainly no more impropriety in arranging phrases of this nature under the present tense, than there is in classing the following modes of expression with that tense. "When he *arrives*, he will hear the news:" "Before he *decides*, he should examine with care:" "The more she *improves* the more amiable she will be." These forms of expression clearly refer to future time, and yet, even by our critics themselves, they are acknowledged to be properly placed in the present tense.

9. Some conjunctions have their corresponding conjunctions belonging to them, so that, in the subsequent member of the sentence, the latter answers to the former: as,

1. THOUGH,—YET, NEVERTHELESS: as, "*Though* he was rich, *yet* for our sakes he became poor."
2. WHETHER—OR: as, "*Whether* he will go *or* not, I cannot tell."
3. EITHER—OR: as, "I will *either* send it, *or* bring it myself."
4. NEITHER—NOR: as, "*Neither* thou *nor* I am able to compass it."
5. AS—AS: expressing a comparison of equality: as, "She is *as* amiable *as* her sister."
6. AS—SO: expressing a comparison of equality: as, "*As* the stars, *so* shall thy seed be."
7. AS—SO: expressing a comparison of quality: as, "*As* the one dieth, *so* dieth the other."
8. SO—AS: with a verb expressing a comparison of quality: as, "To see thy glory, *so as* I have seen thee in the sanctuary."
9. SO—AS: with a negative and an adjective expressing a comparison of quantity: as, "Pompey was not *so* great a man *as* Cæsar."
10. SO—THAT: expressing a consequence: as, "He was *so* fatigued, *that* he could scarcely move."

The conjunctions *or* and *nor* may often be used, with nearly equal propriety. "The king, whose character was not sufficiently vigorous, *nor* decisive, assented to the measure." In this sentence, *or* would perhaps have been better: but, in general, *nor* seems to repeat the negation in the former part of the sentence, and therefore gives more emphasis to the expression.

10. Conjunctions are often improperly used, both singly and in pairs. The following are examples of this impropriety. "The relations are so uncertain, as that they require a great deal of examination:" it should be, "*that* they require," &c. "There was no man so sanguine, who did not apprehend some ill consequences:" it ought to be, "So sanguine as not to apprehend," &c.; or, "no man, how sanguine soever, who did not," &c. "To trust in him is no more but to acknowledge his power." "This is no other but the gate of paradise." In both these instances, *but* should be *than*. "We should sufficiently weigh the objects of our hope; whether they are such as we may reasonably expect from them what they propose," &c. It ought to be, "*that* we may reasonably," &c. "The duke had not behaved with that loyalty as he ought to have done;" "*with which* he ought." "In the order as they lie in his preface:" it should be, "in order as they lie;" or, "in the order *in which* they lie." Such sharp replies that cost him his life;" "*as* cost him," &c. "If he were truly that scarecrow, as he is now commonly painted;" "*such* a scarecrow," &c. "I wish I could do that justice to his memory, to oblige the painters," &c.; "do *such* justice *as* to oblige," &c.

There is a peculiar neatness in a sentence beginning with the conjunctive form of a verb. "*Were* there no difference, there would be no choice."

A double conjunctive, in two correspondent clauses of a sentence, is sometimes made use of: as, "*Had* he done this, he *had* escaped;" "*Had* the limitations on the prerogative been, in his time, quite fixed and certain, his integrity *had* made him regard as sacred, the boundaries of the constitution." The sentence in the common form would have read thus: "If the limitations on the prerogative had been, &c. his integrity would have made him regard," &c.

The particle *as*, when it is connected with the pronoun *such*, has the force of a relative pronoun: as, "Let *such as* presume to advise others, look well to their own conduct;" which is equivalent to, "Let *them who* presume," &c. But when used by itself, this particle is frequently, if not always, to be considered as a conjunction, or perhaps as an adverb.

Some respectable grammarians suppose, that the word *as* is always a pronoun; and that, in every situation, it has the meaning of *it*, *that*, or *which*. They would, however, find it difficult to prove, that, in the following sentences, this word has the meaning of any one of those pronouns. "*As* to those persons, I must say, *as* it is due to them, that they were *as* disinterested *as* their opponents." "Love thy neighbour *as* thyself." "Forgive us our debts *as* we forgive our debtors." "And *as* Paul was long preaching, Eutychus sunk down."

Our language wants a conjunction adapted to familiar style, equivalent to *notwithstanding*. The words *for all that*, seem to be too low. "The word was in the mouth of every one, but, for all that, the subject may still be a secret."

In regard that is solemn and antiquated; *because* would do much better in the following sentence. "It cannot be otherwise, in regard that the French prosody differs from that of every other language."

The word *except* is far preferable to *other than*. "It admitted of no effectual cure other than amputation." *Except* is also to be preferred to *all but*. "They were happy all but the stranger."

In the two following phrases, the conjunction *as* is improperly omitted; "Which nobody presumes, or is so sanguine ‸ to hope." "I must, however, be so just ‸ to own."

The conjunction *that* is often properly omitted, and understood: as, "I beg you would come to me;" "See

thou do it not;" instead of "that you would," "that thou do." But in the following and many similar phrases, this conjunction were much better inserted: "Yet it is reason the memory of their virtues remain to posterity." It should be, "yet it is *just that* the memory," &c.

RULE XX.

WHEN the qualities of different things are compared, the latter noun or pronoun is not governed by the conjunction *than* or *as*, but agrees with the verb, or is governed by the verb or the preposition, expressed or understood: as, "Thou art wiser than I;" that is, "than I am." "They loved him more than me;" i. e. "more than they loved me." "The sentiment is well expressed by Plato, but much better by Solomon than him;" that is, "than by him."

See vol. ii. p. 133.

THE propriety or impropriety of many phrases, in the preceding as well as in some other forms, may be discovered, by supplying the words that are not expressed; which will be evident from the following instances of erroneous construction. "He can read better than me." "He is as good as her." "Whether I be present or no." "Who did this? Me." By supplying the words understood in each of these phrases, their impropriety and governing rule will appear: as, "Better than I can read;" "As good as she is;" "Present or not present;" "I did it."

1. By not attending to this rule, many errors have been committed: a number of which is subjoined, as a further caution and direction to the learner. "Thou art a much greater loser than me by his death." "She suffers hourly

more than me." "We contributed a third more than the Dutch, who were obliged to the same proportion more than us." "King Charles, and more than him, the duke and the popish faction, were at liberty to form new schemes." "The drift of all his sermons was, to prepare the Jews for the reception of a prophet mightier than him, and whose shoes he was not worthy to bear." "It was not the work of so eminent an author, as him to whom it was first imputed." "A stone is heavy, and the sand weighty; but a fool's wrath is heavier than them both." "If the king give us leave, we may perform the office as well as them that do." In these passages it ought to be, "*I*, *we*, *he*, *they*, respectively."

When the relative *who* immediately follows *than*, it seems to form an exception to the 20th rule; for in that connexion, the relative must be in the objective case: as, "Alfred, *than whom*, a greater king never reigned," &c. "Beelzebub, *than whom*, Satan excepted, none higher sat," &c. It is remarkable that in such instances, if the personal pronoun were used, it would be in the nominative case; as, "A greater king never reigned *than he*," that is, "*than he was*." "Beelzebub, *than he*," &c.; that is, "*than he sat*." The phrase *than whom*, is, however, avoided by the best modern writers.

Some grammarians suppose that the words *than* and *but* are sometimes used as prepositions, and govern the objective case. They adopt this idea, from the difficulty, if not impossibility as they conceive, of explaining many phrases, on any other principle. This plea of necessity appears, however, to be groundless. The principle of supplying the ellipsis is, we think, sufficient to resolve every case, in which *than* or *but* occurs, without wresting these words from their true nature, and giving them the character of prepositions. In the preceding paragraphs under this Rule, we have exhibited a number of examples, showing that the supply of the ellipsis sufficiently explains their con-

struction. But as these may be deemed obvious cases, we shall select some, which appear to be more difficult in their developement. The following are of this nature. "I saw nobody but him;" "No person but he was present;" "More persons than they saw the action;" "The secret was communicated to more men than him;" "This trade enriched some people more than them." All these sentences may be explained, on the principle of supplying the ellipsis, in the following manner. In the first, we might say, "I saw nobody, but *I saw* him;" or, "I saw nobody, but him *I saw;*" in the second, "None was present, but he *was present;*" in the third, "More persons than they *were*, saw the action," or, "More than *these persons were*, saw the action;" in the fourth, "The secret was communicated to more persons than *to* him;" in the fifth, "This trade enriched some people more than *it enriched* them."—The supply of the ellipsis certainly gives an uncouth appearance to these sentences: but this circumstance forms no solid objection to the truth of the principle for which we contend. Most of the idioms in a language could not be literally accounted for, but by very awkward modes of expression.

If the rule which has been recommended, effectually answers the purpose of ascertaining the cases of nouns and pronouns, in connexion with the words *than* and *but*, why should we have recourse to the useless expedient of changing these words into other parts of speech; especially when this expedient would often produce ambiguity, and lead into error? That it would have this effect might be shown in numerous instances. One, however, will be sufficient. "If we use the word *than* as a preposition, we should say, 'I love her better than him,' whether it be meant, 'I love her better than I love him,' or, 'I love her better than he does.' By using the word, as a conjunction, the ambiguity is prevented. For, if the former sentiment is implied, we say, 'I love her better than him;'

that is, 'than I love him;' if the latter, we say, 'I love her better than he,' that is, 'than he loves her.'"

If it should be said, that *but* and *than* may be properly supplied by the prepositions *except* and *besides*, and that therefore the substitution of the latter for the former must be allowable; we reply, that, in numerous instances, these words cannot be properly substituted for each other. But if this could be universally done, it might still be said, that equivalence of meaning, by no means implies identity of grammatical construction. This, we think, has been fully proved in the sixth Chapter of Etymology, Section 1. page 110.

From what has been advanced on this subject, the following rule may be laid down. "When the pronoun following *but* or *than*, has exactly the same bearing and relation as the preceding noun or pronoun has, with regard to other parts of the sentence, it must have the same grammatical construction." By applying this rule to the various examples already exhibited, the reader will, we doubt not, perceive its propriety and use.

That the student may be still further assisted, in his endeavours to discover the true grammatical construction of a noun or pronoun following *but* or *than*, it may not be improper to observe, that the 18th Rule of Syntax may be considered as subsidiary to the preceding rule, and to the principle of supplying the ellipsis. Thus, in the expression, "I saw nobody but him," *nobody* is in the objective case, governed by the verb *saw;* and *him* is in the same case, because conjunctions, according to Rule the 18th, connect the same cases of nouns and pronouns. In the phrase, "Nobody but he was present," *he* is in the nominative case, because it is connected by the conjunction *but*, with the noun *nobody*, which is in the nominative. The other sentences, in which the conjunction *than* is used, may be construed in the same manner.

If the 18th Rule of Syntax should not appear to apply to every example, which has been produced in this discussion, nor to others which might be adduced; it will be found, on strict examination, that the supposed exceptions are, in fact, sentences which do not come within the reason and limitation of the rule. Thus, in the sentence, "I have a greater respect for them than he," the pronoun *he* is connected by the conjunction *than* with the pronoun *them*: and yet they are not put in the same case; because they have not the same bearing and relation, with regard to the rest of the sentence; which is requisite according to Rule 18, and its explanatory note. See the Note at page 301.

The two latter rules are founded on the principle of supplying the ellipsis, and are intimately connected with it: they in fact derive all their authority from that principle. They may, however, be of use to the student, by presenting the subject in different points of view: some of them may strike his attention, more than others, and lead him to a full developement of the subject.

RULE XXI.

To avoid disagreeable repetitions, and to express our ideas in few words, an ellipsis, or omission of some words, is frequently admitted. Instead of saying, "He was a learned man, he was a wise man, and he was a good man;" we make use of the ellipsis, and say, "He was a learned, wise, and good man."

When the omission of words would obscure the sentence, weaken its force, or be attended with an impropriety, they must be expressed. In the sen-

tence; "We are apt to love who love us," the word *them* should be supplied. "A beautiful field and trees," is not proper language. It should be, "Beautiful fields and trees;" or, "A beautiful field and fine trees."

See vol. ii. p. 134.

Almost all compounded sentences, are more or less elliptical; some examples of which may be seen under the different parts of speech.

1. The ellipsis of the *article* is thus used: "A man, woman, and child;" that is, "a man, a woman, and a child." "A house and garden;" that is, "A house and a garden." "The sun and moon;" that is, "the sun and the moon." "The day and hour;" that is, "the day and the hour." In all these instances, the article being once expressed, the repetition of it becomes unnecessary. There is, however, an exception to this observation, when some peculiar emphasis requires a repetition; as in the following sentence: "Not only the year, but the day and the hour." In this case, the ellipsis of the last article would be improper. When a different form of the article is requisite, the article is also properly repeated: as, "*a* house and *an* orchard;" instead of, "a house and orchard."

2. The *noun* is frequently omitted in the following manner. "The laws of God and man;" that is, "the laws of God and the laws of man." In some very emphatical expressions, the ellipsis should not be used: as, "Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God;" which is more emphatical than, "Christ the power and wisdom of God."

3. The ellipsis of the *adjective* is used in the following manner. "A delightful garden and orchard;" that is, "a delightful garden and a delightful orchard." "A little man and woman;" that is, "A little man and a little woman." In such elliptical expressions as these, the adjective ought to have exactly the same signification, and to be quite as proper, when joined to the latter substantive as the former; otherwise the ellipsis should not be admitted.

Sometimes the ellipsis is improperly applied to nouns of different nnmbers: as, "A magnificent house and gardens." In this case it is better to use another adjective: as, "A magnificent house and fine gardens."

4. The following is the ellipsis of the *pronoun*. "I love and fear him;" that is, "I love him, and I fear him." "My house and lands;" that is, "my house and my lands." In these instances the ellipsis may take place with propriety; but if we would be more express and emphatical, it must not be used: as, "His friends and his foes;" "My sons and my daughters."

In some of the common forms of speech, the relative pronoun is usually omitted: as, "This is the man they love;" instead of, "This is the man *whom* they love." "These are the goods they bought;" for, "These are the goods *which* they bought."

In complex sentences, it is much better to have the relative pronoun expressed: as it is more proper to say, "The posture in which I lay," than, "In the posture I lay:" "The horse on which I rode, fell down;" than, "The horse I rode, fell down."

The antecedent and the relative connect the parts of a sentence together; and, to prevent obscurity and confusion, they should answer to each other with great exactness. "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have

seen." Here the ellipsis is manifestly improper, and ought to be supplied: as, "We speak that *which* we do know, and testify that *which* we have seen."

5. The ellipsis of the *verb* is used in the following instances. "The man was old and crafty;" that is, "the man was old, and the man was crafty." "She was young, and beautiful, and good;" that is, "She was young, she was beautiful, and she was good." "Thou art poor, and wretched, and miserable, and blind, and naked." If we would fill up the ellipsis in the last sentence, *thou art* ought to be repeated before each of the adjectives.

If, in such enumeration, we choose to point out one property above the rest, that property must be placed last, and the ellipsis supplied: as, "She is young and beautiful, and she is good."

"I went to see and hear him;" that is, "I went to see him, and I went to hear him." In this instance, there is not only an ellipsis of the governing verb, *I went*, but likewise of the sign of the infinitive mood, which is governed by it.

Do, did, have, had, shall, will, may, might, and the rest of the auxiliaries of the compound tenses, are frequently used alone, to spare the repetition of the verb: as, "He regards his word, but thou dost not:" i. e. "dost not regard it." "We succeeded, but they did not;" "did not succeed." "I have learned my task, but you have not;" "have not learned." "They must, and they shall be punished;" that is, "they must be punished."

The auxiliary verbs are often very properly omitted before the principal verb: as, "I have seen and heard him frequently;" not, "I *have* heard:" "He will lose his estate, and incur reproach;" not, "he *will* incur." But when any thing is emphatically expressed, or when oppo-

sition is denoted, this ellipsis should be avoided: as, "I have seen, and I have heard him too;" "He was admired, but he was not beloved."

6. The ellipsis of the *adverb* is used in the following manner. "He spoke and acted wisely;" that is, "He spoke wisely, and he acted wisely." "Thrice I went and offered my service;" that is, "Thrice I went, and thrice I offered my service."

7. The ellipsis of the *preposition*, as well as of the verb, is seen in the following instances: "He went into the abbeys, halls, and public buildings;" that is, "he went into the abbeys, he went into the halls, and he went into the public buildings." "He also went through all the streets and lanes of the city;" that is, "Through all the streets, and through all the lanes," &c. "He spoke to every man and woman there," that is, "to every man and to every woman." "This day, next month, last year;" that is, "on this day, in the next month, in the last year." "The Lord do that which seemeth him good;" that is, "which seemeth *to* him."

8. The ellipsis of the *conjunction* is as follows: "They confess the power, wisdom, goodness, and love, of their Creator;" i. e. "the power, and wisdom, and goodness, and love of," &c. "Though I love him, I do not flatter him," that is, "Though I love him, *yet* I do not flatter him."

There is a very common ellipsis of the conjunction *that*: as, "He told me he would proceed immediately;" "I desired he would not be too hasty;" "I fear it comes too much from the heart:" instead of; "He told me *that* he would proceed immediately;" "I desired *that* he would not be too hasty;" "I fear *that* it comes too much from the heart."—This ellipsis is tolerable in conversation, and

in epistolary writing: but it should be sparingly indulged, in every other species of composition. The French do not use this mode of expression: they avoid the ellipsis on such occasions.

9. The ellipsis of the *interjection* is not very common: it, however, is sometimes used: as, "Oh! pity and shame!" that is, "Oh pity! Oh shame!

As the ellipsis occurs in almost every sentence in the English language, numerous examples of it might be given; but only a few more can be admitted here.

In the following instance, there is a very considerable one: "He will often argue, that if this part of our trade were well cultivated, we should gain from one nation; and if another, from another;" that is, "He will often argue, that if this part of our trade were well cultivated, we should gain from one nation, and if another part of our trade were well cultivated, we should gain from another nation."

Sometimes a considerable part of a sentence is properly omitted, when we presume that the nominative case and its whole regimen may be readily understood: as, "Nature has given to animals one time to act, and another to rest:" instead of saying: "Nature has given to animals one time to act, and nature has given to animals another time to rest."

The following instances, though short, contain much of the ellipsis; "Wo is me;" i. e. "wo is to me." "To let blood;" i. e. "to let out blood." "To let down;" i. e. "to let it fall or slide down." "To walk a mile;" i. e. "to walk through the space of a mile." "To sleep all night;" i. e. "To sleep through all the night." "To go a fishing;" "To go a hunting;" i. e. "to go on a fishing voyage or business;" "to go on a hunting party." "I dine at two o'clock;" i. e. "at two of the clock." "By sea, by land, on shore;" i. e. "By the sea, by the land, on the shore."

It is very frequent, when the word *notwithstanding* agrees with a number of words, or with an entire clause, to omit the whole except this word: and in this use of *notwithstanding*, we have a striking proof of the value of abbreviations in language. For example: "Moses said, let no man leave of it till the morning: *notwithstanding*, they hearkened not unto him." Here *notwithstanding* appears without the clause to which it belongs: and to complete the sense in words, it would be necessary to repeat the whole preceding clause, or the substance of it.—"Moses said, let no man leave of it till the morning. *Notwithstanding this command of Moses*, or, *notwithstanding Moses said that which has been recited*, they hearkened not unto Moses."—"Folly meets with success in this world: but it is true *notwithstanding*, that it labours under disadvantages." This passage, at length, would read thus: "Folly meets with success in the world: but it is true, *notwithstanding folly meets with success in the world*, that it labours under disadvantages."

It is not unusual to apply a pronoun, *this*, *that*, *which*, or *what*, to represent nearly the whole of a sentence: as, "Bodies which have no taste, and no power of affecting the skin, may, notwithstanding *this*, act upon organs which are more delicate." Here *this* stands for, "*they have no taste, and no power to affect the skin*."

In the following example, the pronoun and participle are omitted: "Conscious of his own weight and importance, the aid of others was not solicited." Here the words *he being* are understood; that is, "He being conscious of his own weight and importance." This clause constitutes the case absolute, or, the nominative absolute; which is not so obvious before, as after, the ellipsis is supplied.

10. The examples that follow are produced to show the impropriety of ellipsis in some particular cases. "The land was always possessed, during pleasure, by those in-

trusted with the command;" it should be, "those *persons* intrusted;" or, "those *who were* intrusted." "If he had read further, he would have found several of his objections might have been spared:" that is, "he would have found *that* several of his objections," &c. "There is nothing men are more deficient in, than knowing their own characters." It ought to be, "nothing *in which* men;" and, "than *in* knowing." "I scarcely know any part of natural philosophy would yield more variety and use;" it should be, "*which* would yield," &c. "In the temper of mind he was then;" i. e. "*in which* he then was." "The little satisfaction and consistency, to be found in most of the systems of divinity I have met with, måde me betake myself to the sole reading of the Scriptures:" it ought to be, "*which are* to be found," and, "*which* I have met with." "He desired they might go to the altar together, and jointly return their thanks to whom only they were due;" i. e. "*to him* to whom," &c.

RULE XXII.

ALL the parts of a sentence should correspond to each other: a regular and dependent construction, throughout, should be carefully preserved. The following sentence is therefore inaccurate: "He was more beloved, but not so much admired, as Cinthio." It should be, "He was more beloved than Cinthio, but not so much admired."

See vol. ii. p. 140.

THE first example under this rule, presents a most irregular construction, namely, "He was more beloved *as* Cinthio." The words *more* and *so much*, are very improperly stated as having the same regimen. In correcting such sentences, it is not necessary to supply the latter ellipsis of the corrected sentence, by saying, "but not so

much admired *as Cinthio was;*" because the ellipsis cannot lead to any discordant or improper construction, and the supply would often be harsh or inelegant.—*See* RULE XX. *and the Notes under it.*

As the 22nd Rule comprehends all the preceding rules, it may, at the first view, appear to be too general to be useful. But by ranging under it a number of sentences peculiarly constructed, we shall perceive, that it is calculated to ascertain the true grammatical construction of many modes of expression, which none of the particular rules can sufficiently explain.

"This dedication may serve for almost any book, that has, is, or shall be published." It ought to be, "that has been, or shall be published." "He was guided by interests always different, sometimes contrary to, those of the community;" "different *from;*" or, "always different from those of the community, and sometimes contrary to them." "Will it be urged that these books are as old, or even older than tradition?" The words, "as old," and "older," cannot have a common regimen; it should be "as old as tradition, or even older." "It requires few talents to which most men are not born, or at least may not acquire;" "or which, at least, they may not acquire." "The court of chancery frequently mitigates and breaks the teeth of the common law." In this construction, the first verb is said, "to mitigate the teeth of the common law," which is an evident solecism. "Mitigates the common law, and breaks the teeth of it," would have been grammatical.

"They presently grow into good humour, and good language towards the crown;" "grow into good language," is very improper. "There is never wanting a set of evil instruments, who either out of mad zeal, private hatred, or filthy lucre, are always ready," &c. We say

properly, "A man acts out of mad zeal," or, "out of private hatred;" but we cannot say, if we would speak English, "he *acts* out of filthy lucre." "To double her kindness and caresses of me:" the word "kindness" requires to be followed by either *to* or *for*, and cannot be construed with the preposition *of*. "Never was man so teased or suffered half the uneasiness, as I have done this evening:" the first and third clauses, viz. "Never was man so teased, as I have done this evening," cannot be joined without an impropriety; and to connect the second and third, the word *that* must be substituted for *as*; "Or suffered half the uneasiness that I have done;" or else, "half so much uneasiness as I have suffered."

The first part of the following sentence abounds with adverbs, and those such as are hardly consistent with one another: "*How much soever* the reformation of this degenerate age is *almost utterly* to be despaired of, we may yet have a more comfortable prospect of future times." The sentence would be more correct in the following form: "*Though* the reformation of this degenerate age is *nearly* to be despaired of," &c.

"Oh! shut not up my soul with the sinners, nor my life with the blood-thirsty; in whose hands is wickedness, and *their* right-hand is full of gifts." As the passage, introduced by the copulative conjunction *and*, was not intended as a continuation of the principal and independent part of the sentence, but of the dependent part, the relative *whose* should have been used instead of the possessive *their*; viz. "and *whose* right-hand is full of gifts."

The following sentences, which give the passive voice the regimen of an active verb, are very irregular, and by no means to be imitated. "The bishops and abbots were allowed their seats in the house of lords." "Thrasea was forbidden the presence of the emperor." "He was shown that very story in one of his own books." These sentences should have been; "The bishops and abbots were

allowed to have (or to take) their seats in the house of lords;" or, "Seats in the house of lords were allowed to the bishops and abbots:" "Thrasea was forbidden to approach the presence of the emperor;" or, "The presence of the emperor was forbidden to Thrasea:" "That very story was shown to him in one of his own books."

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither *have* entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." There seems to be an impropriety in this sentence, in which the same noun serves in a double capacity, performing at the same time the offices both of the nominative and objective cases. "Neither *hath* it entered into the heart of man, to conceive the things," &c. would have been regular.

"We have the power of retaining, altering, and compounding, those images which we have once received, into all the varieties of picture and vision." It is very proper to say, "altering and compounding those images which we have once received, into all the varieties of picture and vision;" but we can with no propriety say, "retaining them into all the varieties;" and yet, according to the manner in which the words are ranged, this construction is unavoidable: for, "retaining, altering, and compounding," are participles, each of which equally refers to, and governs the subsequent noun, *those images;* and that noun again is necessarily connected with the following preposition, *into.* The construction might easily have been rectified, by disjoining the participle *retaining* from the other two participles, in this way: "We have the power of retaining those images which we have once received, and of altering and compounding them into all the varieties of picture and vision;" or, perhaps, better thus: "We have the power of retaining, altering,

and compounding those images which we have once received, and of forming them into all the varieties of picture and vision."

THE INTERJECTION.

THE syntax of the Interjection is of so very limited a nature, that it does not require a distinct, appropriate rule; especially as every thing which relates to it, in this point of view, has already been mentioned under other rules. See Rule V. Note 11: and Rule xxi. Note 9.

It may not, however, be improper to observe, in addition to what we formerly mentioned respecting the nature of this part of speech, that the genuine Interjection, which is always expressive of some strong sensation, does not owe its characteristic expression to the arbitrary form of articulation; but derives its force from the tone of voice and modification of countenance and gesture. These tones and gestures consequently express the same meaning, or nearly the same, independently of any necessary relation to the articulation which they may assume; and they are therefore universally understood.

DIRECTIONS FOR PARSING.

As we have finished the explanation of the different parts of speech, and the rules for forming them into sentences, it is now proper to give some examples of the manner in which the learners should be exercised, in order to prove their knowledge, and to render it familiar to them. This is called parsing. The nature of the subject, as well as the adaptation of it to learners, requires that it should be divided into two parts; viz. parsing, as it respects etymology alone; and parsing, as it respects both etymology and syntax*.

SECTION 1.

Specimen of etymological parsing.

"Virtue ennobles us."

Virtue is a common substantive of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case. *(Decline the noun). Ennobles* is a regular verb active, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person singular. *(Repeat the present tense, the imperfect tense, and the perfect participle†.) Us* is a personal pronoun, of the first person plural, and in the objective case. *(Decline the pronoun.)*

"Goodness will be rewarded."

Goodness is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the

* See the "General Directions for using the English Exercises," mentioned in the Note at page 43 of the second volume of this work.

† The learner should occasionally repeat all the moods and tenses of the verb.

nominative case. *(Decline it.)* *Will be rewarded* is a regular verb, in the passive voice, the indicative mood, the first future tense, and the third person singular. *(Repeat the present tense, the imperfect tense, and the perfect participle.)*

"Strive to improve."

Strive is an irregular verb neuter, in the imperative mood, and of the second person singular. *(Repeat the present tense, &c.)* *To improve* is a regular verb neuter, and in the infinitive mood. *(Repeat the present tense, &c.)*

"Time flies, O! how swiftly."

Time is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case. *(Decline the noun.)* *Flies* is an irregular verb neuter, the indicative mood, present tense, and the third person singular. *(Repeat the present tense, &c.)* *O!* is an interjection. *How* and *swiftly* are adverbs.

"Gratitude is a delightful emotion."

Gratitude is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case. *(Decline it.)* *Is* is an irregular verb neuter, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person singular. *(Repeat the present tense, &c.)* *A* is the indefinite article. *Delightful* is an adjective in the positive state. *(Repeat the degrees of comparison.)* *Emotion* is a common substantive of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case. *(Decline it.)*

"They who forgive, act nobly."

They is a personal pronoun, of the third person, the plural number, and in the nominative case. *(Decline it.)* *Who* is a relative pronoun, and in the nominative case.

(Decline it.) *Forgive* is an irregular verb active, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person plural. *(Repeat the present tense, &c.)* *Act* is a regular verb active, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person plural. *(Repeat, &c.)* *Nobly* is an adverb of quality. *(Repeat the degrees of comparison.)*

"By living temperately, our health is promoted."

By is a preposition. *Living* is the present participle of the regular neuter verb "to live." *(Repeat the participles.)* *Temperately* is an adverb of quality. *Our* is an adjective pronoun of the possessive kind. *(Decline it.)* *Health* is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case. *(Decline it.)* *Is promoted* is a regular verb passive, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person singular. *(Repeat, &c.)*

"We should be kind to them, who are unkind to us."

We is a personal pronoun, of the first person, the plural number, and in the nominative case. *(Decline it.)* *Should be* is an irregular verb neuter, in the potential mood, the imperfect tense, and the first person plural. *(Repeat the present tense, &c.)* *Kind* is an adjective, in the positive state. *(Repeat the degrees of comparison.)* *To* is a preposition. *Them* is a personal pronoun, of the third person, the plural number, and in the objective case. *(Decline it.)* *Who* is a relative pronoun, and in the nominative case. *(Decline it.)* *Are* is an irregular verb neuter, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person plural. *(Repeat, &c.)* *Unkind* is an adjective in the positive state. *(Repeat the degrees of comparison.)* *To* is a preposition. *Us* is a personal pronoun, of the first person, the plural number, and in the objective case. *(Decline it.)*

Section 2.

Specimens of syntactical parsing.

"Vice produces misery."

Vice is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case. *Produces* is a regular verb active, indicative mood, present tense, the third person singular, agreeing with its nominative "vice," according to RULE I. which says; *(here repeat the rule.)* *Misery* is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and the objective case governed by the active verb "produces," according to RULE XI. which says, &c.

"Peace and joy are virtue's crown."

Peace is a common substantive. *(Repeat the gender, person, number, and case.)* *And* is a copulative conjunction. *Joy* is a common substantive. *(Repeat the person, number, and case.)* *Are* is an irregular verb neuter, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person plural, agreeing with the nominative case "peace and joy," according to RULE II. which says; *(here repeat the rule.)* *Virtue's* is a common substantive, of the third person, the singular number, and in the possessive case, governed by the substantive "crown," agreeably to RULE X. which says, &c. *Crown* is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case, according to the fourth note of RULE XI.

"Wisdom or folly governs us."

Wisdom is a common substantive. *(Repeat the gender, person, number, and case.)* *Or* is a disjunctive conjunction.

Folly is a common substantive. *(Repeat the gender, person, number, and case.)* *Governs* is a regular verb active, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person singular, agreeing with its nominative case "wisdom" or "folly," according to RULE III. which says, &c. *Us* is a personal pronoun, of the first person, plural number, and in the objective case, governed by the active verb "governs," agreeably to RULE XI. which says, &c.

"Every heart knows its sorrows."

Every is an adjective pronoun of the distributive kind, agreeing with its substantive "heart," according to Note 2 under RULE VIII. which says, &c. *Heart* is a common substantive. *(Repeat the gender, person, number, and case.)* *Knows* is an irregular verb active, indicative mood, present tense, third person singular, agreeing with its nominative case "heart," according to RULE I. which says, &c. *Its* is a personal pronoun, of the third person singular, and of the neuter gender, to agree with its substantive "heart," according to RULE V. which says, &c. it is in the possessive case, governed by the noun "sorrows," according to RULE X. which says, &c. *Sorrows* is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the plural number, and in the objective case governed by the active verb "knows," according to RULE XI. which says, &c.

"The man is happy who lives wisely."

The is the definite article. *Man* is a common substantive. *(Repeat the gender, person, number, and case.)* *Is* is an irregular verb neuter, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person singular, agreeing with the nominative case "man," according to RULE I. which says, &c. *Happy* is an adjective in the positive state.

Who is a relative pronoun, which has for its antecedent, "man," with which it agrees in gender and number, according to RULE V. which says, &c. *Lives* is a regular verb neuter, indicative mood, present tense, third person singular, agreeing with its nominative "who," according to RULE VI. which says, &c. *Wisely* is an adverb of quality, placed after the verb, according to RULE XV.

"Who preserves us?"

Who is a relative pronoun of the interrogative kind, and in the nominative case singular. The word to which it relates, (its subsequent,) is the noun or pronoun containing the answer to the question; according to a note under RULE VI. *Preserves* is a regular verb active, indicative mood, present tense, third person singular, agreeing with its nominative "who," according to RULE VI. which says, &c. *Us* is a personal pronoun. *(Repeat the person, number, case, and rule.)*

"Whose house is that? My brother's and mine.
"Who inhabit it? We."

Whose is a relative pronoun of the interrogative kind, and relates to the following words, "brother's" and "mine," agreeably to a note under RULE VI. It is in the possessive case, governed by "house," according to RULE X. which says, &c. *House* is a common substantive. *(Repeat the gender, person, number, and case.)* *Is* is an irregular verb neuter, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person singular, agreeing with its nominative case "house," according to RULE I. which says, &c. *That* is an adjective pronoun of the demonstrative kind. *My* is an adjective pronoun of the possessive kind. *Brother's* is a common substantive, of the masculine gender, the third person, the singular

number, and in the possessive case, governed by "house" understood, according to RULE X. and a note under RULE VI. *And* is a copulative conjunction. *Mine* is a personal pronoun, of the first person, the singular number, and in the possessive case, according to a note under RULE X. and another under RULE VI. *Who* is a relative pronoun of the interrogative kind, of the plural number, in the nominative case, and relates to "we" following, according to a note under RULE VI. *Inhabit* is a regular verb active. *(Repeat the mood, tense, person, &c.)* *It* is a personal pronoun, of the third person, the singular number, and in the objective case, governed by the active verb "inhabit," according to RULE XI. which says, &c. *We* is a personal pronoun, of the first person, the plural number, and the nominative case to the verb "inhabit" understood. The words "inhabit it" are implied after "we," agreeably to a note under RULE VI.

"Remember to assist the distressed."

Remember is a regular verb active, imperative mood, the second person singular, and agrees with its nominative case "thou" understood. *To assist* is a regular verb active, in the infinitive mood, governed by the preceding verb "remember," according to RULE XII. which says, &c. *The* is the definite article. *Distressed* is an adjective put substantively.

"We are not unemployed."

We is a personal pronoun. *(Repeat the person, number, and case.)* *Are* is an irregular verb neuter. *(Repeat the mood, tense, person, &c.)* *Not* is an adverb of negation. *Unemployed* is an adjective in the positive state. The two negatives *not* and *un*, form an affirmative, agreeably to RULE XVI. which says, &c.

"This bounty has relieved you and us; and has gratified "the donor."

This is an adjective pronoun of the demonstrative kind. *Bounty* is a common substantive. *(Repeat the gender, person, number, and case.)* *Has relieved* is a regular verb active, indicative mood, perfect tense, third person singular, agreeing with its nominative "bounty," according to RULE I. which says, &c. *You* is a personal pronoun, of the second person plural, and in the objective case. *(Repeat the government and rule.)* *And* is a copulative conjunction. *Us* is a personal pronoun, in the objective case. *You* and *us* are put in the same case, according to RULE XVIII. which says, &c. *And* is a copulative conjunction. *Has gratified* is a regular verb active, indicative mood, perfect tense, and third person singular, agreeing with its nominative "bounty," understood. "*Has relieved*" and "*has gratified*," are in the same mood and tense, according to RULE XVIII. which says, &c. *The* is the definite article. *Donor* is a common substantive, of the third person, the singular number, and in the objective case, governed by the active verb "has gratified," according to RULE XI. which says, &c.—*See p. 79, on gender.*

"He will not be pardoned, unless he repent."

He is a personal pronoun, of the third person, singular number, masculine gender, and in the nominative case. *Will be pardoned* is a regular passive verb, indicative mood, first future tense, and the third person singular, agreeing with its nominative "he," according to RULE I. and composed of the auxiliaries "will be," and the perfect participle "pardoned." *Not* is a negative adverb. *Unless* is a disjunctive conjunction. *He* is a personal pronoun. *(Repeat the person, number, gender, and case.)*

Repent is a regular verb neuter, in the subjunctive mood, the present tense, the third person singular, and agrees with its nominative case "he," according to RULE I. which says, &c. It is in the subjunctive mood, because it implies a future sense, and denotes uncertainty signified by the conjunction "unless," agreeably to RULE XIX. and the notes.

"They could obtain the object of their wishes, if they "would be resolute."

They is a personal pronoun. *(Repeat the person, number, and case.)* *Could obtain* is a regular verb active, potential mood, imperfect tense, third person plural, agreeing with its nominative "they," according to RULE I. which says, &c. *The* is the definite article. *(Repeat the definition.)* *Object* is a common substantive, of the third person, the singular number, and in the objective case, governed by the active verb "could obtain," agreeably to RULE XI. which says, &c. *Of* is a preposition. *Their* is an adjective pronoun of the possessive sort, agreeing with its substantive "wishes," according to RULE VIII. which says, &c. *Wishes* is a common snbstantive, of the third person, the plural number, and in the objective case, governed by the preposition *of*, according to RULE XVII. which says, &c. The phrase, *the object of their wishes*, may be termed an "objective phrase," governed by the active verb "could obtain," according to a note under RULE XI. page 268. *If* is a copulative conjunction. *They* is a personal pronoun. *(Repeat the person, number, and case.)* *Would be* is an irregular verb neuter, in the subjunctive mood, imperfect tense, of the third person plural, agreeing with its nominative case "they," in number and person. It is in the subjunctive mood, according to a note at page 138.

(Define the subjunctive mood.) *Resolute* is an adjective in the positive state, and belongs to its substantive "persons" understood, according to RULE VIII. which says, &c.

"To be pure in heart, pious, and benevolent, which "all may be, constitutes human happiness."

To be pure in heart, pious, and benevolent, is the antecedent to the pronoun "which," according to a note under Chapter V. of Etymology, page 94. This phrase is also the nominative case to the verb "constitutes," according to note 1, under RULE I. *Which* is a relative pronoun, having for its antecedent the phrase beforementioned. It is in the nominative case, according to RULE XI. note 4. *All* is an adjective pronoun of the indefinite kind, agreeing with its substantive "persons" understood, according to RULE VIII. which says, &c. *May be* is an irregular verb neuter, in the potential mood, present tense, and the third person plural, agreeing with the nominative case "all," according to RULE I. which says, &c. *Constitutes* is a regular verb active, indicative mood, present tense, third person singular, agreeing with its nominative case the phrase above mentioned. *Human* is an adjective, which agrees with its substantive "happiness," according to RULE VIII. which says, &c. *Happiness* is a common substantive. *(Repeat the gender, person, number, case, and government.)*

"Good works being neglected, devotion is false."

Good works being neglected, being independent on the rest of the sentence, is the case absolute, according to the fifth note of RULE I. *Devotion* is a common substantive.

(Repeat the gender, number, person, and case.) *Is* is an irregular verb neuter. *(Repeat the mood, tense, person, &c.)* *False* is an adjective in the positive state, and belongs to its substantive "devotion" understood, agreeably to RULE VIII. which says, &c.

"The emperor, Marcus Aurelius, was a wise and virtuous "prince."

The is the definite article. *Emperor* is a common substantive, of the masculine gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case. *Marcus Aurelius* is a proper name or substantive, and in the nominative case, because it is put in apposition with the substantive "emperor," agreeably to the first note of RULE X. *Was* is an irregular verb neuter, indicative mood, imperfect tense, and the third person singular, agreeing with its nominative case "emperor," according to RULE I. *A* is the indefinite article. *Wise* is an adjective, and belongs to its substantive "prince." *And* is a copulative conjunction. *Virtuous* is an adjective, and belongs, &c. *Prince* is a common substantive, and in the nominative case, according to the fourth note of RULE XI.

"To err is human."

To err, is the infinitive mood, and the nominative case to the verb "is." *Is* is an irregular verb neuter, indicative mood, present tense, and the third person singular, agreeing with its nominative case "to err," according to Note 1, under RULE the first. *Human* is an adjective, and belongs to its substantive "nature" understood, according to RULE VIII. which says, &c.

"To countenance persons who are guilty of bad actions, is "scarcely one remove from actually committing them."

To countenance persons who are guilty of bad actions, is part of a sentence, which is the nominative case to the verb "is." *Is* is an irregular verb neuter, &c. agreeing with the aforementioned part of a sentence, as its nominative case, according to Note 1. under RULE the first. *Scarcely* is an adverb. *One* is a numeral adjective, agreeing with its substantive "remove." *Remove* is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the singular number, and in the nominative case, according to the fourth note of RULE XI. *From* is a preposition. *Committing* is the present participle of the regular active verb "to commit." *Them* is a personal pronoun, of the third person, the plural number, and in the objective case, governed by the participle "committing," agreeably to RULE XIV. which says, &c.

"Charles was ardent, inconsiderate, and regardless of "advice, qualities incident to youth."

Charles is a proper name or substantive. *(Repeat the person, number, and case.)* *Was* is an irregular verb neuter. *(Repeat the mood, tense, person, number, and agreement.)* *Ardent*, *inconsiderate*, and *regardless*, are adjectives in the positive state, and belong to the substantive "Charles," according to RULE VIII. which says, &c. These adjectives are joined together by the conjunction *and* expressed between the two latter, and understood between the two former. *Of* is a preposition. *Advice* is a common substantive, of the third person, the singular number, and in the objective case, governed by the preposition *of*, according to RULE XVII. which says, &c. *Quali-*

ties is a common substantive, of the neuter gender, the third person, the plural number, and in the nominative case. This word "qualities," is put in apposition to the preceding clause, or part of the sentence, according to the observations in the second paragraph under RULE X. *Incident* is an adjective in the positive state, and belongs to its substantive "qualities," according to RULE VIII. which says, &c. *To* is a preposition. *Youth* is a common substantive, of the third person, the singular number, and in the objective case, governed by the preposition *to*, according to RULE XVII. which says, &c.

"Let me proceed."

This sentence, according to the statement of grammarians in general, is in the imperative mood, of the first person, and the singular number. The sentence may, however, be analyzed in the following manner. *Let* is an irregular verb active, in the imperative mood, of the second person, the plural number, and agrees with its nominative case "you" understood: as, "do you let." *Me* is a personal pronoun, of the first person, the singular number, and in the objective case, governed by the active verb "let," agreeably to RULE XI. which says, &c. *Proceed* is a regular verb neuter, in the infinitive mood, governed by the preceding verb "let," according to RULE XII. which says, &c.

"Living expensively and luxuriously destroys health."
"By living frugally and temperately, health is "preserved."

Living expensively and luxuriously, is the nominative case to the verb "destroys," according to Note 1, under RULE I. *Living frugally and temperately*, is a substantive

phrase in the objective case, governed by the preposition "by," according to Note 2, under RULE XIV.

The preceding specimens of parsing, if carefully studied by the learner, seem to be sufficiently explicit, to enable him to comprehend the nature of this employment; and sufficiently diversified, to qualify him, in other exercises, to point out and apply the remaining rules, both principal and subordinate.

The student may derive some advantage in the business of Parsing, and some improvement in the radical knowledge of many of the rules of syntax, by consulting the second chapter of the Exercises in Parsing, contained in volume ii. of this work; especially the ninth section of that chapter, entitled, "Mode of verbally correcting erroneous sentences."

PART IV.

PROSODY.

PROSODY consists of two parts: the former teaches the true PRONUNCIATION of words, comprising ACCENT, QUANTITY, EMPHASIS, PAUSE, and TONE; and the latter, the laws of VERSIFICATION.

CHAPTER I.

OF PRONUNCIATION.

SECTION 1.

Of Accent.

ACCENT is the laying of a peculiar stress of the voice, on a certain letter or syllable in a word, that it may be better heard than the rest, or distinguished from them: as, in the word *presúme*, the stress of the voice must be on the letter *u*, and second syllable, *sume*, which take the accent.

As words may be formed of a different number of syllables, from one to eight or nine, it was necessary to have some peculiar mark to distinguish words from mere syllables; otherwise speech would be only a continued

succession of syllables, without conveying ideas: for, as words are the marks of ideas, any confusion in the marks, must cause the same in the ideas for which they stand. It was therefore necessary, that the mind should at once perceive what number of syllables belongs to each word, in utterance. This might be done by a perceptible pause at the end of each word in speaking, as we form a certain distance between them in writing and printing. But this would make discourse extremely tedious; and though it might render words distinct, would make the meaning of sentences confused. Syllables might also be sufficiently distinguished, by a certain elevation or depression of voice upon one syllable of each word, which was the practice of some nations. But the English tongue has, for this purpose, adopted a mark of the easiest and simplest kind, which is called accent, and which effectually answers the end.

Every word in our language, of more than one syllable, has one of them distinguished from the rest in this manner: and some writers assert, that every monosyllable of two or more letters, has one of its letters thus distinguished.

Accent is either principal or secondary. The principal accent is that, which necessarily distinguishes one syllable in a word from the rest. The secondary accent is that stress, which we may occasionally place upon another syllable, besides that which has the principal accent; in order, to pronounce every part of the word more distinctly, forcibly, and harmoniously: thus, "Complaisant, caravan," and "violin," have frequently an accent on the first as well as on the last syllable, though a somewhat less forcible one. The same may be observed of "Repartee, referee, privateer, domineer," &c. But it must be observed, that though an accent is allowed on the first syllable of these words, it is by no means necessary; they may all be pronounced with one accent, and

that on the last syllable, without the least deviation from propriety.

As emphasis evidently points out the most significant word in a sentence; so, where other reasons do not forbid, the accent always dwells with greatest force on that part of the word which, from its importance, the hearer has always the greatest occasion to observe: and this is necessarily the root or body of the word. But as harmony of termination frequently attracts the accent from the root to the branches of words, so the first and most natural law of accentuation seems to operate less in fixing the stress than any other. Our own Saxon terminations, indeed, with perfect uniformity, leave the principal part of the word in quiet possession of what seems its lawful property; but Latin and Greek terminations, of which our language is full, assume a right of preserving their original accent, and subject almost every word they bestow upon us to their own classical laws.

Accent, therefore, seems to be regulated, in a great measure, by etymology. In words from the Saxon, the accent is generally on the root; in words from the learned languages, it is generally on the termination; and if to these we add the different accent we lay on some words, to distinguish them from others, we seem to have the three great principles of accentuation; namely, the *radical*, the *terminational*, and the *distinctive*. The radical: as, "Lóve, lóvely, lóveliness;" the terminational: as, "Hármony, harmónious;" the distinctive: as, "Cónvert, to convért."

ACCENT ON DISSYLLABLES.

Words of two syllables have necessarily one of them accented, and but one. It is true, for the sake of emphasis, we sometimes lay an equal stress upon two successive syllables: as, "Dí-réct, sóme-tímes;" but when

these words are pronounced alone, they have never more than one accent. The word "á-mén," is the only word which is pronounced with two accents when alone.

Of dissyllables, formed by affixing a termination, the former syllable is commonly accented: as, "Chíldish, kíngdom, áctest, ácted, tóilsome, lóver, scóffer, faírer, fóremost, zéalous, fúlness, meékly, ártist."

Dissyllables, formed by prefixing a syllable to the radical word, have commonly the accent on the latter: as, "To beseém, to bestów, to retúrn."

Of dissyllables, which are at once nouns and verbs, the verb has commonly the accent on the latter, and the noun, on the former syllable: as, "To cemént, a cément; to contráct, a cóntract; to preságe, a présage."

This rule has may exceptions. Though verbs seldom have their accent on the former, yet nouns often have it on the latter syllable: as, "Delíght, perfúme." Those nouns which, in the common order of language, must have preceded the verbs, often transmit their accent to the verbs they form, and inversely. Thus, the noun "wáter," must have preceded the verb "to wáter," as the verb "to correspónd," must have preceded the noun "correspóndent:" and "to pursúe" claims priority to "pursúit." So that we may conclude, wherever verbs deviate from the rule, it is seldom by chance, and generally in those words only where a superior law of accent takes place.

All dissyllables ending in *y*, *our*, *ow*, *le*, *ish*, *ck*, *ter*, *age*, *en*, *et*: as, Cránny, lábour, wíllow, wállow;" (except "allów, avów, endów, belów, bestów;) báttle, bánish, cámbric, bátter, coúrage, fásten, quíet;" accent the former syllable.

Dissyllable nouns in *er*: as, "Cánker, bútter," have the accent on the former syllable.

Dissyllable verbs, terminating in a consonant and *e* final: as, "Compríse, escápe;" or having a diphthong in the last syllable; as, "Appéase, revéal;" or ending in two

consonants; as, "Attend;" have the accents on the latter syllable.

Dissyllable nouns, having a diphthong in the latter syllable, have commonly their accent on the latter syllable: as, "Appláuse;" except some words in *ain:* as, Víllain, cúrtain, moúntain."

Dissyllables that have two vowels, which are separated in the pronunciation, have always the accent on the first syllable: as, "Líon, ríot, quíet, líar, rúin;" except "creáte."

ACCENT ON TRISYLLABLES.

Trisyllables formed by adding a termination, or prefixing a syllable, retain the accent of the radical word: as, "Lóveliness, ténderness, contémner, wágoner, phýsical, bespátter, comménting, comménding, assúrance."

Trisyllables ending in *ous, al, ion:* as, "Árduous, cápital, méntion," accent the first.

Trisyllables ending in *ce, ent,* and *ate,* accent the first syllable: as, "Coúntenance, cóntinence, ármament, ímminent, élegant, própagate;" unless they are derived from words having the accent on the last: as, "Connívance, acquáintance;" and unless the middle syllable has a vowel before two consonants; as, "Promúlgate."

Trisyllables ending in *y,* as, "Éntity, spécify, líberty, víctory, súbsidy," commonly accent the first syllable.

Trisyllables in *re* or *le,* accent the first syllable: as, "Légible, théatre;" except "Discíple," and some words which have a preposition: as, "Exámple, indénture."

Trisyllables ending in *ude,* commonly accent the first syllable: as, Plénitude, hábitude, réctitude."

Trisyllables ending in *ator,* have the accent on the middle syllable: as, "Spectátor, creátor," &c.; except "órator, sénator, bárrator, légator."

Trisyllables which have in the middle syllable a diphthong; as, "Endéavour;" or a vowel before two consonants; as, "Doméstic;" accent the middle syllable.

Trisyllables that have their accent on the last syllable are commonly French: as, "Acquiésce, repartée, magazíne;" or they are words formed by prefixing one or two syllables to a long syllable: as, "Immatúre, overchárge."

ACCENT ON POLYSYLLABLES.

Polysyllables, or words of more than three syllables, generally follow the accent of the words from which they are derived: as, "Árrogating, cóntinency, incóntinently, comméndable, commúnicableness."

Words ending in *ator* have the accent generally on the penultimate, or last syllable but one: as, "Emendátor, gladiátor, equivocátor, prevaricátor."

Words ending in *le* commonly have the accent on the first syllable: as "Ámicable, déspicable:" unless the second syllable has a vowel before two consonants: as, "Combústible, condémnable."

Words ending in *ion, ous*, and *ty*, have their accent on the antepenultimate, or last syllable but two: as, "Salvátion, victórious, actívity."

Words which end in *ia, io*, and *cal*, have the accent on the antepenult: as, "Cyclopædia, punctílio, despótical."

The rules repecting accent, are not advanced as complete or infallible, but proposed as useful. Almost every rule of every language has its exceptions; and, in English, as in other tongues, much must be learned by example and authority.

It may be further observed, that though the syllable on which the principal accent is placed, is fixed and certain, yet we may, and do, frequently make the secondary principal, and the principal secondary: thus, "Caravan, com-

plaisant, violin, repartee, referree, privateer, domineer," may all have the greater stress on the first, and the less on the last syllable, without any violent offence to the ear: nay, it may be asserted, that the principal accent on the first syllable of these words, and none at all on the last, though certainly improper, has nothing in it grating or discordant; but placing an accent on the second syllable of these words, would entirely derange them, and produce a great harshness and dissonance. The same observations may be applied to "demonstration, lamentation, provocation, navigator, propagator, alligator," and every similar word in the language.

Section 2.

Of Quantity.

The quantity of a syllable, is that time which is occupied in pronouncing it. It is considered as long or short.

A vowel or syllable is long, when the accent is on the vowel; which occasions it to be slowly joined in pronunciation with the following letters: as, "Fāll, bāle, mōōd, hōūse, fēature."

A syllable is short, when the accent is on the consonant; which occasions the vowel to be quickly joined to the succeeding letter: as, "Ănt, bŏnnĕt, hŭngĕr."

A long syllable generally requires double the time of a short one in pronouncing it: thus, "Māte" and "Nōte" should be pronounced as slowly again as "Măt" and "Nŏt."

UNACCENTED syllables are generally short: as, "Ăd-mire, bóldnĕss, sínnĕr." But to this rule there are many exceptions: as, "Álsō, éxīle, gángrēne, úmpīre, fóretāste," &c.

When the accent is on a consonant, the syllable is often more or less short, as it ends with a single consonant, or with more than one: as, "Sádly, róbber; persíst, mátchless."

When the accent is on a semi-vowel, the time of the syllable may be protracted, by dwelling upon the semi-vowel: as, "Cur′, can′, fulfil′:" but when the accent falls on a mute, the syllable cannot be lengthened in the same manner: as, "Búbble, cáptain, tótter."

The quantity of vowels has, in some measure, been considered under the first part of grammar, which treats of the different sounds of the letters; and therefore, we shall only add a few general rules on the subject, and some observations respecting the various degrees of length in the time of the vowels.

1st, All vowels under the principal accent, before the terminations *ia*, *io*, and *ion*, preceded by a single consonant, are pronounced long: as, "Regalia, folio, adhesion, explosion, confusion:" except the vowel *i*, which in that situation is short: as, "Militia, punctilio, decision, contrition." The only exceptions to this rule seem to be, "Discretion, battalion, gladiator, national, and rational."

2d, All vowels that immediately precede the terminations, *ity*, and *ety*, are pronounced long: as, "Deity, piety, spontaneity." But if one consonant precedes these terminations, every preceding accented vowel is short; except *u*, and the *a* in "scarcity," and "rarity:" as, "Polarity, severity, divinity, curiosity;—impunity." Even *u* before two consonants contracts itself: as, "Curvity, taciturnity," &c.

3d, Vowels under the principal accent, before the terminations *ic* and *ical*, preceded by a single consonant, are pronounced short; thus, "Satanic, pathetic, elliptic, harmonic," have the vowel short; while, "Tunic, runic, cubic," have the accented vowel long: and "Fanatical, poetical, levitical, canonical," have the vowel short; but "Cubical, musical," &c. have the *u* long.

4th, The vowel in the antepenultimate syllable of words, with the following terminations, is always pronounced short.

loquy: as, obloquy.
strophe: as, apostrophe.
meter: as, barometer.
gonal: as, diagonal.
vorous: as, carnivorous.
ferous: as, somniferous.
fluous: as, superfluous.
fluent: as, melifluent.
parous: as, oviparous.
cracy: as, aristocracy.
gony: as, cosmogony.
phony: as, symphony.
nomy: as, astronomy.
tomy: as, anatomy.
pathy: as, antipathy.

As no utterance which is void of proportion, can be agreeable to the ear; and as quantity, or proportion of time in utterance, greatly depends on a due attention to the accent; it is absolutely necessary for every person, who would attain a just and pleasing delivery, to be master of that point.

In this work, and in the author's Spelling-book, the vowels *e* and *o*, in the first syllable of such words as, behave, prejudge, domain, propose; and in the second syllable of such as, pulley, turkey, borrow, follow; are considered as long vowels. The second syllables in such words as, baby, spicy, holy, fury, are also considered as long syllables. This arrangement is founded on the general practice of good speakers; and is supported by the authority of the judicious Walker, author of "The Critical Pronouncing Dictionary;" who has uniformly, throughout his celebrated work, assigned to the vowels

e and *o* a long sound, in the syllables just mentioned, and in all others of a similar nature. It might reasonably have been supposed, that the very general approbation, which this performance of Walker has received from the public, would have settled the pronunciation of the vowels and syllables in question. But there are some critical writers, who dispute the propriety of his arrangement; and assert, that the vowels *e* and *o*, in the construction mentioned, are short vowels, and that the syllables which contain them, are, consequently, short syllables. These writers seem to think, that all long syllables are equally long; that there are no degrees in the length of them. In this supposition, they are, however, evidently mistaken. It will doubtless be admitted, that the second syllable of the word *degree*, is longer than the second of the word *coffee;* and that the latter syllables of both these words, are long. In the words *scarecrow*, *wherefore*, both the syllables are unquestionably long, but not of equal length. We presume therefore, that the syllables under consideration, may also be properly styled long syllables, though their length is not equal to that of some others: or, at least, that there can be no objection to a syllable's being long, on the ground of its not being so long, or so much protracted, as some other long syllables are.

Will the opponents of the positions for which we contend, assert, that the syllables referred to, in behave, domain, pulley, borrow, holy, fury, &c. are short syllables? If they are such, the words must be pronounced, beh ave, dom ain, pul leh, bor roh, ho lih, fu rih, &c. There are no other sounds to denote *e* and *o* short. But it is manifest that *e* and *o* short, cannot be the true sounds of the vowels in these words: and that, therefore, they must have the less protracted sounds of *e* and *o* long.— It will not, however, follow, (as the critics insist,) that, on our principles, the words should be pronounced, bee-

have, do-o-main, pul-lee, ho-lee, fu-ree, &c. protracting or drawling out the syllable, to a considerable extent. To do so, would be to accent both the syllables. If the accent is fairly preserved on the proper syllable, this drawling sound will never be heard: the sounds of *e* and *o* long, in their due degrees, will be preserved, and clearly distinguished. In the words *methinks*, *methought*, who would pronounce the first syllable, *mee?* And who would assert, that it ought to be pronounced short, like *e* in met? But we have, perhaps, dwelt too long on this subject; and bestowed too much attention, in controverting a point, which appears to be so little capable of defence; and against which the authority of Walker, and public opinion, are so express and decisive.

Section 3.

Of Emphasis.

By emphasis is meant a stronger and fuller sound of voice, by which we distinguish some word or words on which we design to lay particular stress, and to show how they affect the rest of the sentence. Sometimes the emphatic words must be distinguished by a particular tone of voice, as well as by a greater stress.

On the right management of the emphasis depends the life of pronunciation. If no emphasis be placed on any words, not only will discourse be rendered heavy and lifeless, but the meaning often left ambiguous. If the emphasis be placed wrong, we shall pervert and confound the meaning wholly.

To give a common instance: such a simple question as this, "Do you ride to town to-day?" is capable of no

fewer than four different acceptations, according as the emphasis is differently placed on the words.

If it be pronounced thus: "Do *you* ride to town to-day?" the answer may naturally be, "No, we send a servant in our stead."

If thus: "Do you *ride* to town to-day?" answer, "No, we intend to walk."

"Do you ride *to town* to-day?" "No, we ride into the country."

"Do you ride to town *to-day?*" "No, but we shall to-morrow.

In like manner, in solemn discourse, the whole force and beauty of an expression often depend on the emphatic word; and we may present to the hearers quite different views of the same sentiment, by placing the emphasis differently. In the following words of our Saviour, observe in what different lights the thought is placed, according as the words are pronounced.

"Judas, betrayest thou the son of man with a kiss?" "*Betrayest* thou," makes the reproach turn on the infamy of treachery. "Betrayest *thou,*" makes it rest upon Judas's connexion with his master. "Betrayest thou *the son of man,*" rests it upon our Saviour's personal character and eminence. "Betrayest thou the son of man *with a kiss?*" turns it upon his prostituting the signal of peace and friendship, to the purpose of destruction.

The emphasis often lies on the word that asks a question: as, "*Who* said so?" "*When* will he come?" "*What* shall I do?" "*Whither* shall I go?" "*Why* dost thou weep?" And when two words are set in contrast, or in opposition to one another, they are both emphatic: as, "He is the *tyrant*, not the *father*, of his people;" "His subjects *fear* him, but they do not *love* him."

Some sentences are so full and comprehensive, that almost every word is emphatical: as, "Ye hills and dales, ye rivers, woods, and plains:" or, as that emphatic expos-

tulation in the prophecy of Ezekiel, "Why will ye die!" In the latter short sentence, every word is emphatical; and on which ever word we lay the emphasis, whether on the first, second, third, or fourth, it strikes out a different sense, and opens a new subject of moving expostulation.

Emphasis often falls not only on single words, in different parts of the same sentence, but it is frequently required to be continued, with a little variation, on two, and sometimes more words together. The following sentences exemplify both the parts of this position: "If you seek to make one *rich*, study not *to increase his stores*, but *to diminish his desires*." "The Mexican figures, or picture writing, represent *things* not *words*: they exhibit *images to the eye*, not *ideas to the understanding*."

As accent dignifies the syllable on which it is laid, and makes it more distinguished by the ear than the rest; so emphasis ennobles the word to which it belongs, and presents it in a stronger light to the understanding. Were there no accents, words would be resolved into their original syllables: were there no emphasis, sentences would be resolved into their original words; and, in this case, the hearer would be under the painful necessity, first, of making out the words, and afterwards, their meaning.

Emphasis has been variously divided by different writers. We shall present the student with a view of some of these arrangements; from which he will probably derive clearer and more comprehensive ideas of the subject.

Emphasis is said, by some of them, to consist of two kinds, the simple, and the complex emphasis. Simple, when it serves to point out only the plain meaning of any proposition: complex, when, besides the meaning, it marks also some affection or emotion of the mind; or gives a meaning to words, which they would not have in their usual acceptation. In the former case, emphasis is scarcely more than a stronger accent, with little or no

change of tone; when it is complex, besides force, there is always superadded a manifest change of tone.

The following sentence contains an example of simple emphasis:

"And Nathan said to David, "*Thou* art the man." The emphasis on *thou*, serves only to point out the meaning of the speaker. But in the sentence which follows, we perceive an emotion of the speaker superadded to the simple meaning: "Why will ye die?"

Emphasis has been further distinguished, into the weaker and the stronger emphasis. In the sentence, "Exercise and temperance strengthen the constitution;" we perceive more force on the word *strengthen*, than on any other; though it is not equal to the stress which we apply to the word *indifferent*, in the following sentence: "Exercise and temperance strengthen even an *indifferent* constitution." It is also proper to remark, that the words *exercise*, *temperance*, *constitution*, in the last example but one, are pronounced with greater force, than the particles *and* and *the;* and yet those words cannot properly be called emphatical: for the stress that is laid on them, is no more than sufficient to convey distinctly the meaning of each word.—From these observations it appears, that the smaller parts of speech, namely, the articles, conjunctions, prepositions, &c. are, in general, obscurely and feebly expressed; that the substantives, verbs, and more significant words, are firmly and distinctly pronounced; and that the emphatical words, those which mark the meaning of a phrase, are pronounced with peculiar stress and energy, though varied according to the degree of their importance.

Emphasis has also been divided into the SUPERIOR and the INFERIOR emphasis. The superior emphasis determines the meaning of a sentence, with reference to something said before, presupposed by the author as general knowledge; or removes an ambiguity, where a passage

may have more senses than one. The inferior emphasis *enforces*, *graces*, and *enlivens*, but does not *fix*, the meaning of any passage. The words to which this latter emphasis is given, are, in general, such as seem the most important in the sentence, or, on other accounts, to merit this distinction. The following passage will serve to exemplify the superior emphasis.

> " Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
> " Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> " Brought death into the world, and all our wo," &c.
> " Sing heav'nly Muse!"

Supposing that originally other beings besides men, had disobeyed the commands of the Almighty, and that the circumstance were well known to us, there would fall an emphasis upon the word *man's* in the first line; and hence it would be read thus:

> " Of *man's* first disobedience, and the fruit," &c.

But if it were a notorious truth, that mankind had transgressed in a peculiar manner more than once, the emphasis would fall on *first;* and the line be read;

> " Of man's *first* disobedience," &c.

Again, admitting death (as was really the case) to have been an unheard-of and dreadful punishment, brought upon man in consequence of his transgression; on that supposition the third line would be read;

> " Brought *death* into the world," &c.

But if we were to suppose, that mankind knew there was such an evil as death in other regions, though the

place they inhabited had been free from it till their transgression, the line would run thus:

> "Brought death into the *world*," &c.

The following examples illustrate the nature and use of the inferior emphasis:

"Many persons mistake the *love*, for the *practice* of virtue."

"Shall I reward his services with *falsehood?* Shall I forget *him* who cannot forget *me?*"

"If his principles are *false*, no apology from *himself* can make them *right*: if founded in *truth*, no censure from *others* can make them *wrong*."

> "Though *deep*, yet *clear;* though *gentle*, yet not *dull;*
> "*Strong* without *rage;* without *o'erflowing*, *full*."

A *friend* exaggerates a man's *virtues;* an *enemy*, his *crimes*."

"The *wise man* is happy, when he gains his *own* approbation; the *fool*, when he gains that of *others*."

The superior emphasis, in reading as in speaking, must be determined entirely by the *sense* of the passage, and always made *alike:* but as to the inferior emphasis, *taste* alone seems to have the right of fixing its situation and quantity.

Among the number of persons, who have had proper opportunities of learning to read, in the best manner it is now tanght, very few could be selected, who, in a given instance, would use the inferior emphasis alike, either as to place or quantity. Some persons, indeed, use scarcely any degree of it: and others do not scruple to carry it far beyond any thing to be found in common discourse; and even sometimes throw it upon words so very trifling in themselves, that it is evidently done with no other view, than to give greater variety to the modula-

tion*. Notwithstanding this diversity of practice, there are certainly proper boundaries, within which this emphasis must be restrained, in order to make it meet the approbation of sound judgment and correct taste. It will doubtless have different degrees of exertion, according to the greater or less degree of importance of the words upon which it operates; and there may be very properly some variety in the use of it: but its application is not arbitrary, depending on the caprice of readers.

Emphasis, besides its other offices, is the great regulator of quantity. Though the quantity of our syllables is fixed, in words separately pronounced, yet it is mutable, when these words are rånged in sentences; the long being changed into short, the short into long, according to the importance of the words with regard to meaning: and as it is by emphasis only, that the meaning can be pointed out, emphasis must be the regulator of the quantity. A few examples will make this point very evident.

Pleās'd thoŭ shălt heār—and learn the secret power, &c.
Pleas'd thōū shalt hear—and thou alòne shalt hear—
Pleas'd thou shālt hear—in spite of them shălt hear—
Plèas'd thŏu shălt heār—though not behòld the fair—

In the first of these instances, the words *plèas'd* and *hèar*, being equally emphatical, are both long; whilst the two intermediate words, *thŏu* and *shălt*, being rapidly passed over, as the sense demands, are reduced to a short quantity.

---

* By modulation is meant that pleasing variety of voice, which is perceived in uttering a sentence, and which, in its nature, is perfectly distinct from emphasis, and the tones of emotion and passion. The young reader should be very careful to render his modulation correct and easy; and, for this purpose, should form it upon the model of the most judicious and accurate speakers.

In the second instance, the word *thoù* by being the most important, obtains the chief, or rather the sole emphasis; and thus, it is not only restored to its natural long quantity, but obtains from emphasis a still greater degree of length, than when pronounced in its separate state. This greater degree of length, is compensated by the diminution of quantity in the words *pleas'd* and *hear*, which are sounded shorter than in the preceding instance. The word *shălt* still continues short. Here we may also observe, that though *thou* is long in the first part of the verse, it becomes short when repeated in the second, on account of the more forcible emphasis belonging to the word *alóne* which follows it.

In the third instance, the word *shalt* having the emphasis, obtains a long quantity. And though it is impossible to prolong the sound of this word, as it ends in a pure mute, yet in this, as in all similar instances, the additional quantity is to be made out by a rest of the voice, proportioned to the importance of the word. In this instance, we may also observe, that the word *shalt*, repeated in the second part of the line, is reduced again to a short quantity.

In the fourth instance, the word *héar* placed in opposition to the word *behòld*, in the latter part of the line, obtains from the sense the chief emphasis, and a proportionate length. The words *thou* and *shalt*, are again reduced to short quantities; and the word *pleas'd* lends some of the time which it possessed, to the more important word *hear*.

From these instances, it is evident, that the quantity of our syllables is not fixed; but governed by emphasis.—To observe a due measurement of time, on all occasions, is doubtless very difficult; but by instruction, attention, and practice, the difficulty may be overcome.

Emphasis changes, not only the quantity of words and syllables, but also, in particular cases, the seat of the ac-

cent. This is demonstrable from the following examples: "He shall *ín*crease, but I shall *dé*crease." "There is a difference between giving and *fór*giving." "In this species of composition, *plaú*sibility is much more essential than *pró*bability." In these examples, the emphasis requires the accent to be placed on syllables, to which it does not commonly belong.

In order to acquire the proper management of the emphasis, the great rule, and indeed the only rule possible to be given, is, that the speaker or reader study to attain a just conception of the force and spirit of the sentiments which he is to pronounce. For to lay the emphasis with exact propriety, is a constant exercise of good sense and attention. It is far from being an inconsiderable attainment. It is one of the greatest trials of a true and just taste; and must arise from feeling delicately ourselves, and from judging accurately, of what is fittest to strike the feelings of others.

There is one error, against which it is particularly proper to caution the learner; namely, that of multiplying emphatical words too much. It is only by a prudent reserve in the use of them, that we can give them any weight. If they recur too often; if a speaker or reader attempts to render every thing which he expresses of high importance, by a multitude of strong emphases, we soon learn to pay little regard to them. To crowd every sentence with emphatical words, is like crowding all the pages of a book with Italic characters, which, as to the effect, is just the same as to use no such distinctions at all.

SECTION 4.

Of Pauses.

PAUSES or rests, in speaking and reading, are a total cessation of the voice during a perceptible, and, in many cases, a measurable space of time.

PAUSES are equally necessary to the speaker, and the hearer. To the speaker, that he may take breath, without which he cannot proceed far in delivery; and that he may, by these temporary rests, relieve the organs of speech, which otherwise would be soon tired by continued action: to the hearer, that the ear also may be relieved from the fatigue, which it would otherwise endure from a continuity of sound; and that the understanding may have sufficient time to mark the distinction of sentences, and their several members.

There are two kinds of pauses: first, emphatical pauses; and next, such as mark the distinctions of the sense. An emphatical pause is made, after something has been said of peculiar moment, and on which we desire to fix the hearer's attention. Sometimes, before such a thing is said, we usher it in with a pause of this nature. Such pauses have the same effect as a strong emphasis; and are subject to the same rules; especially to the caution just now given, of not repeating them too frequently. For as they excite uncommon attention, and of course raise expectation, if the importance of the matter is not fully answerable to such expectation, they occasion disappointment and disgust.

But the most frequent and the principal use of pauses, is, to mark the divisions of the sense, and at the same time

to allow the speaker to draw his breath; and the proper and delicate adjustment of such pauses, is one of the most nice and difficult articles of delivery. In all reading, and public speaking, the management of the breath requires a good deal of care, so as not to oblige us to divide words from one another, which have so intimate a connexion, that they ought to be pronounced with the same breath, and without the least separation. Many sentences are miserably mangled, and the force of the emphasis totally lost, by the divisions being made in the wrong place. To avoid this, every one, while he is speaking or reading, should be very careful to provide a full supply of breath for what he is to utter. It is a great mistake to imagine, that the breath must be drawn only at the end of a period, when the voice is allowed to fall. It may easily be gathered at the intervals of the period, when the voice is only suspended for a moment; and, by this management, one may always have a sufficient stock for carrying on the longest sentence, without improper interruptions.

Pauses in reading, and public discourse, must be formed upon the manner in which we utter ourselves in ordinary, sensible conversation; and not upon the stiff artificial manner which we acquire, from reading books according to the common punctuation. It will by no means be sufficient to attend to the points used in printing; for these are far from marking *all* the pauses which ought to be made in speaking. A mechanical attention to these resting-places, has perhaps been one cause of monotony, by leading the reader to a similar tone at every stop, and a uniform cadence at every period. The primary use of points is, to assist the reader in discerning the grammatical construction; and it is only as a secondary object, that they regulate his pronunciation.

To render pauses pleasing and expressive, they must not only be made in the right place, but also accompanied

with a proper tone of voice, by which the nature of these pauses is intimated; much more than by the length of them, which can seldom be exactly measured. Sometimes it is only a slight and simple suspension of voice that is proper; sometimes a degree of cadence in the voice is required: and sometimes that peculiar tone and cadence which denote the sentence to be finished. In all these cases, we are to regulate ourselves, by attending to the manner in which nature teaches us to speak, when engaged in real and earnest discourse with others.

It is a general rule, that the suspending pause should be used when the sense is incomplete; and the closing pause, when it is finished. But there are phrases, in which, though the sense is not completed, the voice takes the closing, rather than the suspending pause; and others, in which the sentence finishes by the pause of suspension.

The closing pause must not be confounded with that fall of the voice, or *cadence*, with which many readers uniformly finish a sentence. Nothing is more destructive of propriety and energy than this habit. The tones and inflections of the voice at the close of a sentence, ought to be diversified, according to the general nature of the discourse, and the particular construction and meaning of the sentence. In plain narrative, and especially in argumentation, a small attention to the manner in which we relate a fact, or maintain an argument, in conversation, will show, that it is frequently more proper to raise the voice, than to let it fall, at the end of a sentence. Some sentences are so constructed, that the last words require a stronger emphasis than any of the preceding; while others admit of being closed with a soft and gentle sound. Where there is nothing in the sense which requires the last sound to be elevated or emphatical, an easy fall, sufficient to show that the sense is finished, will be proper. And in pathetic pieces, especially those of the plaintive,

tender, or solemn kind, the tone of the passion will often require a still greater cadence of the voice. The best method of correcting a uniform cadence, is frequently to read *select sentences*, in which the style is pointed, and in which *antitheses* are frequently introduced; and argumentative pieces, or such as abound with interrogatives, or earnest exclamation.

SECTION 5.

Of Tones.

TONES are different both from emphasis and pauses; consisting in the modulation of the voice, the notes or variations of sound which we employ, in the expression of our sentiments.

EMPHASIS affects particular words and phrases, with a degree of tone or inflection of the voice; but tones, peculiarly so called, affect sentences, paragraphs, and sometimes even the whole of a discourse.

To show the use and necessity of tones, we need only observe, that the mind, in communicating its ideas, is in a continual state of activity, emotion, or agitation, from the different effects which those ideas produce in the speaker. Now the end of such communication being, not merely to lay open the ideas, but also the different feelings which they excite in him who utters them, there must be other signs than words, to manifest those feelings; as words uttered in a monotonous manner, can represent only a similar state of mind, perfectly free from all activity or emotion. As the communication of these internal feelings, was of much more consequence in our social intercourse, than the mere conveyance of ideas, the Author of our be-

ing did not, as in that conveyance, leave the invention of the language of emotion, to man; but impressed it himself upon our nature, in the same manner as he has done with regard to the rest of the animal world; all of which express their various feelings, by various tones. Ours indeed, from the superior rank that we hold, are in a high degree more comprehensive; as there is not an act of the mind, an exertion of the fancy, or an emotion of the heart, which has not its peculiar tone, or note of the voice, by which it is to be expressed; and which is suited exactly to the degree of internal feeling. It is chiefly in the proper use of these tones, that the life, spirit, beauty, and harmony of delivery consist.

An extract from the beautiful lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan, may serve as an example of what has been said on this subject.—" The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places. How are the mighty fallen! Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon: lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice; lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph. Ye mountains of Gilboa, let there be no dew, nor rain upon you, nor fields of offerings: for there the shield of the mighty was vilely cast away; the shield of Saul, as though he had not been anointed with oil!" The first of these divisions expresses sorrow and lamentation; therefore the note is low. The next contains a spirited command, and should be pronounced much higher. The other sentence, in which he makes a pathetic address to the mountains where his friends were slain, must be expressed in a note quite different from the two former; not so low as the first, nor so high as the second, in a manly, firm, and yet plaintive tone *.

---

* Herries.

This correct and natural language of the emotions, is not so difficult to be attained, as most readers seem to imagine. If we enter into the spirit of the author's sentiments, as well as into the meaning of his words, we shall not fail to deliver the words in properly varied tones. For there are few people, who speak English without a provincial tone, that have not an accurate use of emphasis, pauses, and tones, when they utter their sentiments in earnest discourse: and the reason that they have not the same use of them, in reading aloud the sentiments of others, may be traced to the very defective and erroneous method, in which the art of reading is taught; whereby all the various, natural, expressive tones of speech, are suppressed, and a few artificial, unmeaning, reading notes, are substituted for them.

But when we recommend to readers, an attention to the tone and language of emotions, we must be understood to do it with proper limitation. Moderation is necessary in this point, as it is in other things. For when reading becomes strictly imitative, it assumes a theatrical manner, and must be highly improper, as well as give offence to the hearers; because it is inconsistent with that delicacy and modesty, which, on all occasions, are indispensable.

CHAPTER II.

OF VERSIFICATION.

AS there are few persons who do not sometimes read poetical composition, it seems necessary to give the student some idea of that part of grammar, which explains the principles of versification; that, in reading poetry, he may be the better able to judge of its correctness, and relish its beauties. When this lively mode of exhibiting nature and sentiment, is perfectly chaste, it is often found to be highly interesting and instructive.

VERSIFICATION is the arrangement of a certain number and variety of syllables, according to certain laws.

Rhyme is the correspondence of the last sound of one verse, to the last sound or syllable of another.

Feet and pauses are the constituent parts of verse. We shall consider these separately.

OF POETICAL FEET.

A certain number of syllables connected, form a foot. They are called *feet*, because it is by their aid that the voice, as it were, steps along through the verse, in a measured pace; and it is necessary that the syllables which mark this regular movement of the voice, should, in some manner, be distinguished from the others. This distinction was made among the ancient Romans, by dividing their syllables into long and short, and ascertaining their quantity, by an exact proportion of time in sounding

them; the long being to the short, as two to one; and the long syllables, being thus the more important, marked the movement. In English, syllables are divided into accented and unaccented; and the accented syllables being as strongly distinguished from the unaccented, by the peculiar stress of the voice upon them, are equally capable of marking the movement, and pointing out the regular paces of the voice, as the long syllables were by their quantity, among the Romans.

When the feet are formed by an accent on vowels, they are exactly of the same nature as the ancient feet, and have the same just quantity in their syllables. So that, in this respect, we have all that the ancients had, and something which they had not. We have in fact duplicates of each foot, yet with such a difference, as to fit them for different purposes, to be applied at our pleasure.

Every foot has, from nature, powers peculiar to itself; and it is upon the knowledge and right application of these powers, that the pleasure and effect of numbers chiefly depend.

All feet used in poetry consist either of two, or of three syllables; and are reducible to eight kinds; four of two syllables, and four of three, as follows:

DISSYLLABLE.	TRISYLLABLE.
A Trochee -⏑	A Dactyl -⏑⏑
An Iambus ⏑-	An Amphibrach ⏑-⏑
A Spondee --	An Anapæst ⏑⏑-
A Pyrrhic ⏑⏑	A Tribrach ⏑⏑⏑

A Trochee has the first syllable accented, and the last unaccented: as, "Hātefŭl, péttish."

An Iambus has the first syllable unaccented, and the last accented; as, "Bĕtrāy, consíst."

A Spondee has both the words or syllables accented: as, "The pāle mōōn."

A Pyrrhic has both the words or syllables unaccented: as, " Ŏn thĕ tall tree."

A Dactyl has the first syllable accented, and the two latter unaccented: as, " Lābŏurĕr, póssible."

An Amphibrach has the first and last syllables unaccented: and the middle one accented: as, " Dĕlīghtfŭl, doméstic."

An Anapæst has the two first syllables unaccented, and the last accented: as, " Cŏntrăvēne, acquiésce."

A Tribrach has all its syllables unaccented: as, " Nūmĕrăblĕ, cónquerable."

Some of these feet may be denominated *principal* feet; as pieces of poetry may be wholly, or chiefly, formed of any of them. Such are the Iambus, Trochee, Dactyl, and Anapæst. The others may be termed *secondary* feet; because their chief use is to diversify the numbers, and to improve the verse.

We shall first explain the nature of the principal feet.

IAMBIC verses may be divided into several species, according to the number of feet or syllables of which they are composed.

1. The shortest form of the English Iambic consists of an Iambus, with an additional short syllable: as,

Dĭsdāinĭng,
Complaining,
Consenting,
Repenting.

We have no poem of this measure, but it may be met with in stanzas. The Iambus, with this addition, coincides with the Amphibrach.

2. The second form of our Iambic, is also too short to be continued through any great number of lines. It consists of *two* Iambuses.

> Whăt plāce ĭs hēre!
> What scenes appear!
> To me the rose
> No longer glows.

It sometimes takes, or may take, an additional short syllable: as,

> Ŭpōn ă mōuntăin
> Beside a fountain.

3. The third form consists of *three* Iambuses.

> Ĭn plācĕs fār ŏr nēar,
> Or famous or obscure,
> Where wholesome is the air,
> Or where the most impure.

It sometimes admits of an additional short syllable: as,

> Oŭr hēarts nŏ lōngĕr lāngŭish.

4. The fourth form is made up of *four* Iambuses.

> Ănd māy ăt lāst mȳ wēarȳ āge,
> Find out the peaceful hermitage.

5. The fifth species of English Iambic, consists of *five* Iambuses.

> Hŏw lōv'd, hŏw vālŭ'd ōnce, ăvāils thĕe nōt,
> To whom related, or by whom begot:
> A heap of dust alone remains of thee;
> 'Tis all thou art, and all the proud shall be.
>
> Bĕ wīse tŏ-dāy, 'tĭs mādnĕss tō dĕfēr;
> Next day the fatal precedent will plead;
> Thus on, till wisdom is pushed out of life.

This is called the *Heroic* measure. In its simplest form it consists of five Iambuses; but by the admission of other feet, as Trochees, Dactyls, Anapæsts, &c. it is capable of many varieties. Indeed, most of the English common measures may be varied in the same way, as well as by the different position of their pauses.

6. The sixth form of our Iambic, is commonly called the *Alexandrine* measure. It consists of *six* Iambuses.

> Fŏr thōu ărt būt ŏf dūst; bĕ hūmblĕ ānd bĕ wīse.

The Alexandrine is sometimes introduced into heroic rhyme; and when used sparingly, and with judgment, occasions an agreeable variety.

> Thĕ sēas shăll wāste, thĕ skīes ĭn smōke dĕcāy,
> Rocks fall to dust, and mountains melt away;
> But fix'd his word, his saving pow'r remains:
> *Thy realm for ever lasts, thy own Messiah reigns.*

7. The seventh and last form of our Iambic measure, is made up of *seven* Iambuses.

> Thĕ Lōrd dĕscēndĕd frōm ăbōve, ănd bōw'd thĕ hēavĕns hīgh.

This was anciently written in one line; but it is now broken into two; the first containing four feet, and the second three:

> Whĕn āll thȳ mērciĕs, Ō mȳ Gōd!
> My rising soul surveys,
> Transported with the view, I'm lost
> In wonder, love, and praise.

In all these measures, the accents are to be placed on even syllables; and every line considered by itself, is, in general, more melodious, as this rule is more strictly observed.

TROCHAIC verse is of several kinds.

1. The shortest Trochaic verse in our language, consists of one Trochee and a long syllable.

> Tūmŭlt cēase,
> Sink to peace.

This measure is defective in dignity, and can seldom be used on serious occasions.

2. The second English form of the Trochaic consists of *two* feet; and is likewise so brief, that it is rarely used for any very serious purpose.

> Ōn thĕ mōuntăin
> By a fountain.

It sometimes contains two feet or trochees, with an additional long syllable: as,

> Īn thĕ dāys ŏf ōld
> Fables plainly told.

3. The third species consists of *three* trochees: as,

> Whēn ŏur hēarts ăre mōurnĭng:

or of three trochees, with an additional long syllable: as,

> Rēstlĕss mōrtăls tōil fŏr nōught;
> Bliss in vain from earth is sought;
> Bliss, a native of the sky,
> Never wanders. Mortals, try;
> There you cannot seek in vain;
> For to seek her is to gain.

4. The fourth Trochaic species consists of *four* trochees: as,

> Rōund ŭs rōars thĕ tēmpĕst lōudĕr,

This form may take an additional long syllable, as follows:

> Īdlĕ āftĕr dīnnĕr īn hĭs chāir,
> Sat a farmer, ruddy, fat, and fair.

But this measure is very uncommon.

5. The fifth Trochaic species is likewise uncommon. It is composed of *five* trochees.

> Āll thăt wālk ŏn fōot ŏr rīde ĭn chāriŏts,
> All that dwell in palaces or garrets.

6. The sixth form of the English Trochaic consists of *six* trochees: as,

> Ōn ă mōuntăin, strētch'd bĕneāth ă hōarȳ wīllŏw,
> Lay a shepherd swain, and view'd the rolling billow.

This seems to be the longest Trochaic line that our language admits.

In all these Trochaic measures, the accent is to be placed on the odd syllables.

The DACTYLIC measure being very uncommon, we shall give only one example of one species of it:

> Frōm thĕ lŏw plēasŭres ŏf thīs făllĕn nātŭre,
> Rise we to higher, &c.

ANAPÆSTIC verses are divided into several species.

1. The shortest anapæstic verse must be a *single* anapæst: as,

> Bŭt ĭn vāin,
> They complain.

This measure is, however, ambiguous; for, by laying the stress of the voice on the first and third syllables, we might

make a trochaic. And therefore the first and simplest form of our genuine Anapæstic verse, is made up of *two* Anapæsts: as,

> Bŭt hĭs cōurăge 'găn fāil,
> For no arts could avail.

This form admits of an additional short syllable.

> Thĕn hĭs cōurăge 'găn fāil hĭm,
> For no arts could avail him.

2. The second species consists of *three* Anapæsts.

> Ŏ yĕ wōods, sprĕad yŏur brānchĕs ăpāce;
> To your deepest recesses I fly;
> I would hide with the beasts of the chase;
> I would vanish from every eye.

This is a very pleasing measure, and much used, both in solemn and cheerful subjects.

3. The third kind of the English Anapæstic, consists of *four* Anapæsts.

> Măy Ĭ gōvĕrn mў pāssĭons wĭth ābsŏlūte swāy;
> And grow wiser and better as life wears away.

This measure will admit of a short syllable at the end: as,

> Ŏn thĕ wārm chĕek ŏf yōuth, smĭles ănd rōsĕs ăre blēndĭng.

The preceding are the different kinds of the principal feet, in their more simple forms. They are capable of numerous variations, by the intermixture of those feet with each other; and by the admission of the secondary feet.

We have observed, that English verse is composed of feet formed by accent; and that when the accent falls on vowels, the feet are equivalent to those formed by quan-

tity. That the student may clearly perceive this difference, we shall produce a specimen of each kind.

O'ĕr hēaps ŏf rūĭns stālk'd thĕ stātelȳ hīnd.

Here we see the accent is upon the vowel in each second syllable. In the following line, we shall find the same Iambic movement, but formed by accent on consonants, except the last syllable.

Then rústling, cráckling, cráshing thúnder dōwn.

Here the time of the short accented syllables, is compensated by a short pause, at the end of each word to which they belong.

We now proceed to show the manner in which poetry is varied and improved, by the admission of secondary feet into its composition.

Múrmuring, and with him fled the shades of night.

The first foot here is a Dactyl; the rest are Iambics.

O'er mány ă frōzen, mány a fīery Alp.

This line contains three Amphibrachs mixed with Iambics.

Īnnūmĕrăblĕ before th' Almighty's throne.

Here, in the second foot, we find a Tribrach.

Seē thĕ bōld yōuth stráin úp the thréat'ning stēep.

In this line, the first foot is a Trochee; the second a genuine Spondee by quantity; the third a Spondee by accent.

In the following line, the first foot is a Pyrrhic, the second a Spondee.

Thăt ŏn wēak wīngs from far pursues your flight.

From the preceding view of English versification, we may see what a copious stock of materials it possesses. For we are not only allowed the use of all the ancient poetic feet, in our heroic measure, but we have, as before observed, duplicates of each, agreeing in movement, though differing in measure*, and which make different impressions on the ear; an opulence peculiar to our language, and which may be the source of a boundless variety.

OF POETICAL PAUSES.

THERE are two sorts of pauses, one for sense, and one for melody, perfectly distinct from each other. The former may be called *sentential*, the latter, *harmonic* pauses.

The sentential pauses are those which are known to us by the name of stops, and which have names given them; as the comma, semicolon, colon, and period.

The harmonic pauses may be subdivided into the *final* pause, and the *cæsural* pause. These sometimes coincide with the sentential pause, sometimes have an independent state, that is, exist where there is no stop in the sense.

The final pause takes place at the end of the line, closes the verse, and marks the measure: the cæsural divides it into equal or unequal parts.

---

* Movement and measure are thus distinguished. *Movement* expresses the progressive order of sounds, whether from strong to weak, from long to short, or *vice versa*. *Measure* signifies the proportion of time, both in sounds and pauses.

The final pause preserves the melody, without interfering with the sense. For the pause itself perfectly marks the bound of the metre; and being made only by a suspension of the voice, not by any change of note, it can never affect the sense. This is not the only advantage gained to numbers, by this final pause or stop of suspension. It also prevents that monotony, that sameness of note at the end of lines, which, however pleasing to a rude, is disgusting to a delicate ear. For as this final pause has no peculiar note of its own, but always takes that which belongs to the preceding word, it changes continually with the matter, and is as various as the sense.

It is the final pause which alone, on many occasions, marks the difference between prose and verse; which will be evident from the following arrangement of a few poetical lines.

"Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste brought death into the world, and all our wo, with loss of Eden, till one greater man restore us, and regain the blissful seat, sing, heavenly muse!"

A stranger to the poem would not easily discover that this is verse; but would take it for poetical prose. By properly adjusting the final pause, we shall restore the passage to its true state of verse.

> Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, and all our wo,
> With loss of Eden, till one greater man
> Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
> Sing, heavenly muse!

These examples show the necessity of reading blank verse, in such a manner, as to make every line sensible to the ear: for, what is the use of melody, or for what end has the poet composed in verse, if, in reading his lines, we suppress his numbers, by omitting the final pause; and degrade them, by our pronunciation, into mere prose?

The Cæsura is commonly on the fourth, fifth, or sixth syllable of heroic verse.

On the fourth syllable, or at the end of the second foot: as,

> The silver eel" in shining volumes roll'd,
> The yellow carp" in scales bedropp'd with gold.

On the fifth syllable, or in the middle of the third foot: as,

> Round broken columns" clasping ivy twin'd,
> O'er heaps of ruin" stalk'd the stately hind.

On the sixth syllable, or at the end of the third foot: as,

> Oh say what stranger cause" yet unexplor'd,
> Could make a gentle belle" reject a lord.

A line may be divided into three portions, by two cæsuras: as,

> Outstretch'd he lay" on the cold ground" and oft"
> Look'd up to heav'n.

There is another mode of dividing lines, well suited to the nature of the couplet, by introducing semi-pauses,

which divide the line into four pauses. This semi-pause may be called a *demi-cæsura*.

The following lines admit of, and exemplify it:

Glows' while he reads" but trembles' as he writes.

Reason' the card" but passion' is the gale.

Rides' in the whirlwind" and directs' the storm.

OF MELODY, HARMONY, AND EXPRESSION.

HAVING shown the general nature of feet and pauses, the constituent parts of verse, we shall now point out, more particularly, their use and importance.

Melody, harmony, and expression, are the three great objects of poetic numbers. By melody, is meant, a pleasing effect produced on the ear, from an apt arrangement of the constituent parts of verse, according to the laws of measure and movement. By harmony, an effect produced by an action of the mind, in comparing the different members of a verse with each other, and perceiving a due and beautiful proportion between them. By expression, such a choice and arrangement of the constituent parts of verse, as serve to enforce and illustrate the thought or the sentiment.

We shall consider each of these three objects in versification, both with respect to the feet and the pauses.

1st, With regard to melody.

From the examples which we have given of verses composed in all the principal feet, it is evident that a considerable portion of melody is found in each of them, though in different degrees. Verses made up of pure Iambics have an excellent melody.

That the final and cæsural pauses contribute to melody, cannot be doubted by any person, who reviews the instances, which we have already given of those pauses. To form lines of the first melody, the cæsura must be at the end of the second, or of the third foot, or in the middle of the third.

2d, With respect to harmony.

Verses composed of Iambics have indeed a fine harmony; but as the stress of the voice, in repeating such verses is always in the same places, that is, on every second syllable, such a uniformity would disgust the ear in a long succession; and therefore such changes were sought for, as might introduce the pleasure of variety, without prejudice to melody; or which might even contribute to its improvement. Of this nature was the introduction of the Trochee, to form the first foot of an heroic verse: as,

> Fāvoŭrs tŏ nōne, tŏ āll shĕ smīles ĕxténds,
> O'ft she rejècts, but never once offends.

Each of these lines begins with a Trochee; the remainin feet are in the Iambic movement. In the following line of the same movement, the fourth foot is a Trochee.

> All thēse ŏur notiŏns vāin, sēes ănd dĕrīdes.

The next change admitted for the sake of variety, without prejudice to melody, is the intermixture of Pyrrhics and Spondees; in which, two impressions in the one foot make up for the want of one in the other; and two long syllables compensate two short ones, so as to make the sum of the quantity of the two feet, equal to two Iambics.

> Ŏn thĕ grēen bānk tŏ lōok ĭntŏ thĕ clēar
> Smōoth lāke thăt tŏ mē seēm'd another sky.
> Stōod rūl'd stōod vāst ĭnfínĭtūde cŏnfīn'd.

The next variety admitted, is that of the Amphibrach.

> Which manў ă bārd hăd cháuntĕd mánў ă dāy.

In this line, we find that two of the feet are Amphibrachs; and three Iambics.

We have before shown that the cæsura improves the melody of verse; and we shall now speak of its other more important office, that of being the chief source of harmony in numbers.

The first and lowest perception of harmony, by means of the cæsura, arises from comparing two members of the same line with each other, divided in the manner to be seen in the instances before mentioned; because the beauty of proportion in the members, according to each of these divisions, is founded in nature; being as one to two—two to three—or three to two.

The next degree arises from comparing the members of a couplet, or two contiguous lines: as,

> See the bold youth" strain up the threat'ning steep,
> Rush thro' the thickets" down the valleys sweep.

Here we find the cæsura of the first line, at the end of the second foot; and in the middle of the third foot, in the last line.

> Hang o'er their coursers' heads" with eager speed,
> And earth rolls back" beneath the flying steed.

In this couplet, the cæsura is at the end of the third foot in the first line; and of the second, in the latter line.

The next perception of harmony arises from comparing a greater number of lines, and observing the relative pro-

portion of the couplets to each other, in point of similarity and diversity: as,

> Thy forests Windsor'' and thy green retreats,
> At once the monarch's'' and the muse's seats,
> Invite my lays.'' Be present Sylvan maids,
> Unlock your springs'' and open all your shades.

> Not half so swift'' the trembling doves can fly,
> When the fierce eagle'' cleaves the liquid sky;
> Not half so swiftly'' the fierce eagle moves,
> When through the clouds'' he drives the trembling doves.

In this way, the comparison of lines variously apportioned by the different seats of the three cæsuras, may be the source of a great variety of harmony, consistent with the finest melody. This is still increased by the introduction of two cæsuras, and much more by that of semi-pauses. The semi-pauses double every where the terms of comparison; give a more distinct view of the whole and the parts; afford new proportions of measurement, and an ampler scope for diversity and equality, those sources of beauty in harmony.

> Warms' in the sun'' refreshes' in the breeze,
> Glows' in the stars'' and blossoms' in the trees;
> Lives' through all life'' extends' through all extent,
> Spreads' undivided'' operates' unspent.

3d, The last object in versification, regards expression.

When men express their sentiments by words, they naturally fall into that sort of movement of the voice, which is consonant to that produced by the emotion in the mind; and the Dactylic or Anapæstic, the Trochaic, Iambic, or Spondaic, prevails even in common discourse, according

to the different nature of the sentiments expressed. To imitate nature, therefore, the poet, in arranging his words in the artificial composition of verse, must take care to make the movement correspond to the sentiment, by the proper use of the several kinds of feet: and this is the first and most general source of expression in numbers.

That a judicious management of the feet and pauses, may be peculiarly expressive of particular operations and sentiments, will sufficiently appear to the learner, by a few select examples under each of those heads.

In the following instance, the vast dimensions of Satan are shown by an uncommon succession of long syllables, which detain us to survey the huge arch fiend, in his fixed posture.

> Sō strētch'd oūt hūge in lēngth the ārch fiend lāy.

The next example affords instances of the power of a Trochee beginning a line, when succeeded by an Iambus.

> .... and sheer within
> Līghts ŏn hĭs fēet: as when a prowling wolf
> Leáps o'ĕr thĕ fénce wĭth eāse ĭntŏ thĕ fōld.

The Trochee which begins the line, shows Satan in the act of lighting: the Iambus that follows, fixes him—"Līghts ŏn hĭs fēet."

The same artifice, in the beginning of the next line, makes us see the wolf—"leáp o'ĕr thĕ fénce."—But as the mere act of leaping over the fence, is not the only circumstance to be attended to, but also the facility with which it is done, this is strongly marked, not only by the smooth foot which follows—"wĭth ēase"—itself very expressive, but likewise by a Pyrrhic preceding the last foot—"ĭntŏ thĕ fōld"—which indeed carries the wolf—"wĭth ēase ĭntŏ thĕ fōld."

The following instances show the effects produced by cæsuras, so placed as to divide the line into very unequal

portions: such as that after the first, and before the last semipede.

> .... thus with the year
> Seasons return, but not to me returns
> Day" or the sweet approach of even or morn.

Here the cæsura after the first semipede *Day*, stops us unexpectedly, and forcibly impresses the imagination with the greatness of the author's loss, the loss of sight.

> No sooner had th' Almighty ceas'd, but all
> The multitude of angels, with a shout
> Loud" as from numbers without number" sweet
> As from blest voices uttering joy.——

There is something very striking in this uncommon cæsura, which suddenly stops the reader, to reflect on the importance of a particular word.

We shall close the subject, with an example containing the united powers of many of the principles which have been explained.

> Dīre wăs the tóssĭng" dēep the grōans" Dĕspāir"
> Ténded the sĭck" búsiest from coúch to coúch"
> And ōvĕr thĕm trĭúmphánt deăth" hĭs dárt"
> Shook" bŭt dĕlāy'd tŏ strīke.

Many of the rules and observations respecting Prosody, are taken from "Sheridan's Art of Reading;" to which book the Compiler refers the ingenious student, for more extensive information on the subject.

[illegible]

PUNCTUATION.

Punctuation* is the art of dividing a written composition into sentences, or parts of sentences, by points or stops, for the purpose of marking the different pauses which the sense, and an accurate pronunciation require.

The Comma represents the shortest pause; the Semicolon, a pause double that of the comma; the Colon, double that of the semicolon; and the Period, double that of the colon.

Punctuation is a modern art. The ancients were entirely unacquainted with the use of our commas, colons, &c.; and wrote not only without any distinction of members and periods, but also without distinction of words: which custom continued till the year 360 before Christ. How the ancients read their works, written in this manner, it is not easy to conceive. After the practice of joining words together had ceased, notes of distinction were placed at the end of every word. This practice, with some variations, continued a considerable time. As it appears that the present usage of stops did not take place, whilst manuscripts and monumental inscrip-

---

* As punctuation is intended to aid both the sense and the pronunciation of a sentence, it could not have been exclusively discussed under the part of Syntax, or of Prosody. The nature of the subject, its extent and importance, and the grammatical knowledge which it presupposes, have induced us to make it a distinct and subsequent article.

PUNCTUATION.

PUNCTUATION* is the art of dividing a written composition into sentences, or parts of sentences, by points or stops, for the purpose of marking the different pauses which the sense, and an accurate pronunciation require.

The Comma represents the shortest pause; the Semicolon, a pause double that of the comma; the Colon, double that of the Semicolon; and the Period, double that of the colon.

PUNCTUATION is a modern art. The ancients were entirely unacquainted with the use of our commas, colons, &c.; and wrote not only without any distinction of members and periods, but also without distinction of words: which custom continued till the year 360 before Christ. How the ancients read their works, written in this manner, it is not easy to conceive. After the practice of joining words together had ceased, notes of distinction were placed at the end of every word. This practice, with some variation, continued a considerable time.

As it appears that the present usage of stops, did not take place, whilst manuscripts and monumental inscrip-

* As punctuation is intended to aid both the sense, and the pronunciation of a sentence, it could not have been exclusively discussed under the part of Syntax, or of Prosody. The nature of the subject, its extent and importance, and the grammatical knowledge which it presupposes, have induced us to make it a distinct and subsequent article.

tions, were the only known methods of conveying knowledge, we must conclude that it was introduced with the art of printing. The introduction was, however, gradual: all the points did not appear at once. The colon, semicolon, and note of admiration, were produced some time after the others. The whole set, as they are now used, came to be established, when learning and refinement had made considerable progress.

As the several articulate sounds, the syllables and words, of which sentences consist, are marked by letters; so the rests and pauses, between sentences and their parts, are marked by points. But though the several articulate sounds, are pretty fully and exactly denoted by letters of known and determinate power; yet the several pauses, which are used in a just pronunciation of discourse, are very imperfectly expressed by points. For the different degrees of connexion between the several parts of sentences, and the different pauses in a just pronunciation, which express those degrees of connexion according to their proper value, admit of great variety: but the whole number of points, which we have to express this variety, amounts only to four. Hence it is, that we are under a necessity of expressing pauses of the same quantity, on different occasions, by different points; and more frequently, of expressing pauses of different quantity by the same points.

From this view of the subject, it is evident that the doctrine of Punctuation must be very imperfect. Few precise rules can be given, which will hold, without exception, in all cases; but much must be left to the judgment and taste of the writer. On the other hand, if a greater number of marks were invented, to express all the possible, different pauses of pronunciation; the doctrine of them would be very perplexed and difficult, and the use of them would rather embarrass than assist the reader. It remains, therefore, that we be content with the Rules of Punctuation,

laid down with as much exactness as the nature of the subject will admit: such as may serve for a general direction, to be accommodated to different occasions; and to be supplied, where deficient, by the writer's judgment.

The precise quantity or duration of each pause cannot be defined; for it varies with the time of the whole. The same composition may be rehearsed in a quicker or a slower time; but the proportion between the pauses should be ever invariable.

In order more clearly to determine the proper application of the points, we must distinguish between an *imperfect phrase*, a *simple sentence*, and *a compound sentence.*

An imperfect phrase contains no assertion, or does not amount to a proposition or sentence: as, "Therefore; in haste; studious of praise."

A simple sentence has but one subject, and one finite verb, expressed or implied: as, "Temperance preserves health."

A compound sentence has more than one subject, or one finite verb, either expressed or understood; or it consists of two or more simple sentences connected together; as, "Good nature mends and beautifies all objects;" "Virtue refines the affections, but vice debases them."

In a sentence, the subject and the verb, or either of them, may be accompanied with several adjuncts: as, the object, the end, the circumstance of time, place, manner, and the like: and the subject or verb may be either immediately connected with them, or mediately; that is, by being connected with something which is connected with some other, and so on: as, "The mind, unoccupied with useful knowledge, becomes a magazine of trifles and follies."

Members of sentences may be divided into simple and compound members. See page 215.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE COMMA.

THE Comma usually separates those parts of a sentence, which, though very closely connected in sense and construction, require a pause between them.

RULE I.

See vol. ii. p. 165.

WITH respect to a simple sentence, the several words of which it consists have so near a relation to each other, that, in general, no points are requisite, except a full stop at the end of it: as, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." "Every part of matter swarms with living creatures."

A simple sentence, however, when it is a long one, and the nominative case is accompanied with inseparable adjuncts, may admit of a pause immediately before the verb: as, "The good taste of the present age, has not allowed us to neglect the cultivation of the English language." "To be totally indifferent to praise or censure, is a real defect in character."

RULE II.

See vol. ii. p. 166.

WHEN the connexion of the different parts of a simple sentence, is interrupted by an imperfect phrase, a comma is usually introduced before the beginning, and at the end of this phrase: as, "I remember, *with gratitude*, his goodness to me:" "His work is, *in many respects*, very

imperfect. It is, *therefore*, not much approved." But when these interruptions are slight and unimportant, the comma is better omitted: as, "Flattery is *certainly* pernicious;" "There is *surely* a pleasure in beneficence."

In the generality of compound sentences, there is frequent occasion for commas. This will appear from the following rules; some of which apply to simple, as well as to compound sentences.

RULE III.

See vol. ii. p. 166.

When two or more nouns occur in the same construction, they are parted by a comma: as, "Reason, virtue, answer one great aim:" "The husband, wife, and children, suffered extremely*:" "They took away their furniture, clothes, and stock in trade:" "He is alternately supported by his father, his uncle, and his elder brother."

From this rule there is mostly an exception, with regard to two nouns closely connected by a conjunction: as, "Virtue *and* vice form a strong contrast to each other;" "Libertines call religion bigotry *or* superstition;" "There is a natural difference between merit *and* demerit, virtue *and* vice, wisdom *and* folly." But if the parts connected are not short, a comma may be inserted, though the conjunction is expressed: as, "Romances may be said to be miserable rhapsodies, *or* dangerous incentives to evil;" "Intemperance destroys the strength of our bodies, *and* the vigour of our minds."

* As a considerable pause in pronunciation, is necessary between the last noun and the verb, a comma should be inserted to denote it. But as no pause is allowable between the last adjective and the noun, under Rule IV. the comma is there properly omitted.

See WALKER's *Elements of Elocution.*

RULE IV.

See vol. ii. p. 167.

Two or more adjectives belonging to the same substantive, are likewise separated by commas: as, "Plain, honest truth, wants no artificial covering;" "David was a brave, wise, and pious man;" "A woman, gentle, sensible, well-educated, and religious;" "The most innocent pleasures are the sweetest, the most rational, the most affecting, and the most lasting."

But two adjectives, immediately connected by a conjunction, are not separated by a comma: as, "True worth is modest *and* retired;" "Truth is fair *and* artless, simple *and* sincere, uniform *and* consistent." "We must be wise *or* foolish; there is no medium."

RULE V.

See vol. i. p. 167.

Two or more verbs, having the same nominative case, and immediately following one another, are also separated by commas: as, "Virtue supports in adversity, moderates in prosperity:" "In a letter, we may advise, exhort, comfort, request, and discuss."

Two verbs immediately connected by a conjunction, are an exception to the above rule: as, "The study of natural history expands *and* elevates the mind;" "Whether we eat *or* drink, labour *or* sleep, we should be moderate."

Two or more participles are subject to a similar rule, and exception: as, "A man, fearing, serving, and loving his Creator;" "He was happy in being loved, esteemed, and respected;" "By being admired *and* flattered, we are often corrupted."

RULE VI.

See vol. ii. p. 168.

Two or more adverbs immediately succeeding one another, must be separated by commas: as, "We are fearfully, wonderfully framed;" "Success generally depends on acting prudently, steadily, and vigorously, in what we undertake."

But when two adverbs are joined by a conjunction, they are not parted by the comma: as, "Some men sin deliberately *and* presumptuously;" "There is no middle state; we must live virtuously *or* vitiously."

RULE VII.

See vol. ii. p. 168.

When participles are followed by something that depends on them, they are generally separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma: as, "The king, *approving the plan*, put it in execution;" "His talents, *formed for great enterprises*, could not fail of rendering him conspicuous;" "All mankind compose one family, *assembled* under the eye of one common Father."

RULE VIII.

See vol. ii. p. 169.

When a conjunction is divided, by a phrase or sentence, from the verb to which it belongs, such intervening phrase has usually a comma at each extremity: as, "They set out early, *and*, before the close of the day, arrived at the destined place."

RULE IX.

See vol. ii. p. 169.

EXPRESSIONS in a direct address, are separated from the rest of the sentence by commas: as, "*My son*, give me thy heart;" "I am obliged to you, *my friends*, for your many favours."

RULE X.

See vol. ii. p. 170.

THE case or nominative absolute, and the infinitive mood absolute, are separated by commas from the body of the sentence: as, "His father dying, he succeeded to the estate;" "At length, their ministry performed, and race well run, they left the world in peace;" "To confess the truth, I was much in fault."

RULE XI.

See vol. ii. p. 170.

NOUNS in apposition, that is, nouns added to other nouns in the same case, by way of explication or illustration, when accompanied with adjuncts, are set off by commas: as, "Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, was eminent for his zeal and knowledge;" "The butterfly, child of the summer, flutters in the sun."

But if such nouns are single, or only form a proper name, they are not divided: as, "Paul the apostle;" "The emperor Antoninus wrote an excellent book."

RULE XII.

See vol. ii. p. 171.

SIMPLE members of sentences connected by comparatives, are, for the most part, distinguished by a comma: as, "*As* the hart panteth after the water brooks, *so* doth my

soul pant after thee;" "*Better* is a dinner of herbs with love, *than* a stalled ox and hatred with it."

If the members in comparative sentences are short, the comma is, in general, better omitted: as, "How much *better* is it to get wisdom *than* gold!" "Mankind act *oftener* from caprice *than* reason."

RULE XIII.

See vol. ii. p. 171.

When words are placed in opposition to each other, or with some marked variety, they require to be distinguished by a comma: as,

> "Tho' deep, yet clear; tho' gentle, yet not dull;
> "Strong, without rage; without o'erflowing, full."

"Good men, in this frail, imperfect state, are often found, not only in union *with*, but in opposition *to*, the views and conduct of one another."

Sometimes, when the word with which the last preposition agrees, is single, it is better to omit the comma before it: as, "Many states were in alliance *with*, and under the protection *of* Rome."

The same rule and restriction must be applied, when two or more nouns refer to the same preposition: as, "He was composed, both under the threatening, and at the approach, *of* a cruel and lingering death;" "He was not only the king, but the father *of* his people."

RULE XIV.

See vol. ii. p. 172.

A remarkable expression, or a short observation, somewhat in the manner of a quotation, may be properly marked with a comma: as, "It hurts a man's pride to say, I do not know;" "Plutarch calls lying, the vice of slaves."

RULE XV.

See vol. ii. p. 172.

RELATIVE pronouns are connective words, and generally admit a comma before them: as, "He preaches sublimely, *who* lives a sober, righteous, and pious life;" "There is no charm in the female sex, *which* can supply the place of virtue."

But when two members, or phrases, are closely connected by a relative, restraining the general notion of the antecedent to a particular sense, the comma should be omitted: as, "Self-denial is the sacrifice which virtue must make;" "A man who is of a detracting spirit, will misconstrue the most innocent words that can be put together." In the latter example, the assertion is not of "a man in general," but of "a man who is of a detracting spirit;" and therefore they should not be separated.

The fifteenth rule applies equally to cases in which the relative is not expressed, but understood: as, "It was from piety, warm and unaffected, that his morals derived strength." "This sentiment, habitual and strong, influenced his whole conduct." In both of these examples, the relative and the verb *which was*, are understood.

RULE XVI.

See vol. ii. p. 173.

A simple member of a sentence, contained within another, or following another, must be distinguished by the comma: as, "to improve time, whilst we are blessed with health, will smooth the bed of sickness." "Very often, while we are complaining of the vanity, and the evils of human life, we make that vanity, and we increase those evils."

If, however, the members succeeding each other, are very closely connected, the comma is unnecessary: as, "Revelation tells us how we may attain happiness."

When a verb in the infinitive mood, follows its governing verb, with several words between them, those words should generally have a comma at the end of them: as, "It ill becomes good and wise men, to oppose and degrade one another."

Several verbs in the infinitive mood, having a common dependence, and succeeding one another, are also divided by commas: as, "To relieve the indigent, to comfort the afflicted, to protect the innocent, to reward the deserving, are humane and noble employments."

RULE XVII.

See vol. ii. p. 174.

When the verb *to be* is followed by a verb in the infinitive mood, which, by transposition, might be made the nominative case to it, the former is generally separated from the latter verb, by a comma: as, "The most obvious remedy is, to withdraw from all associations with bad men." "The first and most obvious remedy against the infection, is, to withdraw from all associations with bad men."

RULE XVIII.

See vol. ii. p. 174.

When adjuncts or circumstances are of importance, and often when the natural order of them is inverted, they may be set off by commas: as, "Virtue must be formed and supported, not by unfrequent acts, but by daily and repeated exertions." "Vices, like shadows, towards the evening of life, grow great and monstrous."

"Our interests are interwoven by threads innumerable;" "By threads innumerable, our interests are interwoven."

RULE XIX.

See vol. ii. p. 175.

WHERE a verb is understood, a comma may often be properly introduced. This is a general rule, which, besides comprising some of the preceding rules, will apply to many cases not determined by any of them: as, "From law arises security; from security, curiosity; from curiosity, knowledge." In this example, the verb "arises" is understood before "curiosity" and "knowledge;" at which words a considerable pause is necessary.

RULE XX.

See vol. ii. p. 176.

THE words, *nay, so, hence, again, first, secondly, formerly, now, lastly, once more, above all, on the contrary, in the next place, in short,* and all other words and phrases of the same kind, must generally be separated from the context by a comma: as, "Remember thy best and first friend; *formerly,* the supporter of thy infancy, and the guide of thy childhood; *now,* the guardian of thy youth, and the hope of thy coming years." "He feared want, *hence,* he over-valued riches." "This conduct may heal the difference, *nay,* it may constantly prevent any in future." "*Finally,* I shall only repeat what has been often justly said." "If the spring put forth no blossoms, in summer there will be no beauty, and in autumn, no fruit; *so,* if youth be trifled away without improvement, riper years may be contemptible, and old age miserable."

In many of the foregoing rules and examples, great regard must be paid to the length of the clauses, and the proportion which they bear to one another. An attention to the sense of any passage, and to the clear, easy communication of it, will, it is presumed, with the aid of the preceding rules, enable the student to adjust the proper pauses, and the places for inserting the commas.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE SEMICOLON.

THE Semicolon is used for dividing a compound sentence into two or more parts, not so closely connected as those which are separated by a comma, nor yet so little dependent on each other, as those which are distinguished by a colon.

See vol. ii. p. 177.

THE Semicolon is sometimes used, when the preceding member of the sentence does not of itself give a complete sense, but depends on the following clause: and sometimes when the sense of that member would be complete without the concluding one: as in the following instances: "As the desire of approbation, when it works according to reason, improves the amiable part of our species in every thing that is laudable; so nothing is more destructive to them, when it is governed by vanity and folly."

"Experience teaches us, that an entire retreat from worldly affairs, is not what religion requires; nor does it even enjoin a long retreat from them."

"Straws swim upon the surface; but pearls lie at the bottom."

"Philosophers assert, that Nature is unlimited in her operations; that she has inexhaustible treasures in reserve; that knowledge will always be progressive; and that all future generations will continue to make discoveries, of which we have not the least idea."

"But all subsists by elemental strife;
"And passions are the elements of life."

CHAPTER III.

OF THE COLON.

The Colon is used to divide a sentence into two or more parts, less connected than those which are separated by a semicolon; but not so independent as separate distinct sentences.

See vol. ii. p. 179.

The Colon may be properly applied in the three following cases.

1. When a member of a sentence is complete in itself, but followed by some supplemental remark, or further illustration of the subject: as, "Nature felt her inability to extricate herself from the consequences of guilt: the gospel reveals the plan of Divine interposition and aid." "Nature confesseth some atonement to be necessary: the gospel discovers that the necessary atonement is made."

"Great works are performed, not by strength, but perseverance: yonder palace was raised by single stones; yet you see its height and spaciousness."

"In faith and hope the world will disagree;
"But all mankind's concern is charity:
"All must be false that thwart this one great end;
"And, all of God, that bless mankind or mend."

2. When a semicolon, or more than one, have preceded, and a still greater pause is necessary, in order to mark the connecting or concluding sentiment: as, "As we perceive the shadow to have moved along the dial, but did

not perceive it moving; and it appears that the grass has grown, though nobody ever saw it grow: so the advances we make in knowledge, as they consist of such insensible steps, are only perceivable by the distance."

"A Divine Legislator, uttering his voice from heaven; an almighty governor, stretching forth his arm to punish or reward; informing us of perpetual rest prepared hereafter for the righteous, and of indignation and wrath awaiting the wicked: these are the considerations which overawe the world, which support integrity, and check guilt."

3. The Colon is commonly used when an example, a quotation, or a speech, is introduced: as, "The Scriptures give us an amiable representation of the Deity, in these words: 'God is love.'" "He was often heard to say: 'I have done with the world, and I am willing to leave it.'"

The propriety of using a colon, or semicolon, is sometimes determined by a conjunction's being expressed, or not expressed: as, "Do not flatter yourselves with the hope of perfect happiness: there is no such thing in the world." "Do not flatter yourselves with the hope of perfect happiness; *for* there is no such thing in the world."

"Where grows?—where grows it not? If vain our toil,
"We ought to blame the culture, not the soil:
"Fix'd to no spot is happiness sincere;
"'Tis no where to be found, or ev'ry where.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE PERIOD.

When a sentence is complete and independent, and not connected in construction with the following sentence, it is marked with a Period.

See vol. ii. p. 181.

Some sentences are independent of each other, both in their sense and construction: as, "Fear God. Honour the King. Have charity towards all men." Others are independent only in their grammatical construction: as, "The Supreme Being changes not, either in his desire to promote our happiness, or in the plan of his administration. One light always shines upon us from above. One clear and direct path is always pointed out to man."

A period may sometimes be admitted between two sentences, though they are joined by a disjunctive or copulative conjunction. For the quality of the point does not always depend on the connective particle, but on the sense and structure of sentences: as, "Recreations, though they may be of an innocent kind, require steady government to keep them within a due and limited province. But such as are of an irregular and vicious nature, are not to be governed, but to be banished from every well-regulated mind."

"He who lifts himself up to the observation and notice of the world, is, of all men, the least likely to avoid censure. For he draws upon himself a thousand eyes, that will narrowly inspect him in every part."

The period should be used after every abbreviated word: as, "M.S. P.S. N.B. A.D. O.S. N.S." &c.

CHAPTER V.

OF THE DASH, NOTES OF INTERROGATION AND EXCLAMATION, AND THE PARENTHESIS.

See vol. ii. p. 183.

SECTION I.

Of the Dash.

THE Dash, though often used improperly by hasty and incoherent writers, may be introduced with propriety, where the sentence breaks off abruptly; where a significant pause is required; or where there is an unexpected turn in the sentiment: as, "If thou art he, so much respected once—but, oh! how fallen! how degraded!" "If acting conformably to the will of our Creator;—if promoting the welfare of mankind around us;—if securing our own happiness;—are objects of the highest moment:—then we are loudly called upon, to cultivate and extend the great interests of religion and virtue." A dash following a stop, denotes that the pause is to be greater than if the stop were alone; and when used by itself, requires a pause of such length as the sense alone can determine.

"Here lies the great——False marble, where?
"Nothing but sordid dust lies here."

"Whatever is, is right.—This world, 'tis true,
"Was made for Cæsar—but for Titus too."

Besides the points which mark the pauses in discourse, there are characters, which denote a different modulation of voice, in correspondence to the sense. These are

The point of INTERROGATION,	?
The point of EXCLAMATION,	!
The PARENTHESIS,	( )

SECTION 2.

Of the INTERROGATORY *point.*

A NOTE of Interrogation is used at the end of an interrogative sentence; that is, when a question is asked: as, "Who will accompany me?" "Shall we always be friends?"

Questions which a person asks himself in contemplation, ought to be terminated by points of interrogation: as, "Who adorned the heavens with such exquisite beauty?" "At whose command do the planets perform their constant revolutions?"

"To whom can riches give repute or trust,
"Content or pleasure, but the good and just?"

A point of interrogation is improper after sentences which are not questions, but only expressions of admiration, or of some other emotion.

"How many instances have we of chastity and excellence in the fair sex!"

"With what prudence does the son of Sirach advise us, in the choice of our companions!"

A note of interrogation should not be employed, in cases where it is only said a question has been asked, and where the words are not used as a question. "The Cyprians asked me why I wept." To give this sentence the interrogative form, it should be expressed thus, "The Cyprians said to me, 'Why dost thou weep?'"

SECTION 3.

Of the EXCLAMATORY *point.*

THE note of Exclamation is applied to expressions of sudden emotion, surprise, joy, grief, &c. and also to invocations or addresses: as, "My friend! this conduct amazes me!" "Bless the Lord, O my soul! and forget not all his benefits!"

"Oh! had we both our humble state maintain'd,
"And safe in peace and poverty remained!"

"Hear me, O Lord! for thy loving kindness is great!"

It is difficult, in some cases, to distinguish between an interrogative and exclamatory sentence: but a sentence, in which any wonder or admiration is expressed, and no answer either expected or implied, may be always properly terminated by a note of exclamation: as, "How much vanity in the pursuits of men!" "Who can sufficiently express the goodness of our Creator!" "What is more amiable than virtue!"

The interrogation and exclamation points are indeterminate as to their quantity or time, and may be equivalent in that respect to a semicolon, a colon, or a period, as the sense may require. They mark an elevation of the voice.

The utility of the points of Interrogation and Exclamation, appears from the following examples, in which the meaning is signified and discriminated solely by the points.

"What condescension!"
"What condescension?"

"How great was the sacrifice!"
"How great was the sacrifice?"

Section 4.

Of the Parenthesis.

A Parenthesis is a clause containing some necessary information, or useful remark, introduced into the body of a sentence obliquely, and which may be omitted without injuring the grammatical construction: as,

"Know then this truth, (enough for man to know,)
"Virtue alone is happiness below."

"And was the ransom paid? It was; and paid
"(What can exalt his bounty more?) for thee."

"To gain a posthumous reputation, is to save four or five letters (for what is a name besides?) from oblivion." "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?"

If the incidental clause is short, or perfectly coincides with the rest of the sentence, it is not proper to use the parenthetical characters. The following instances are therefore improper uses of the parenthesis. "Speak you (who saw) his wonders in the deep." "Every planet (as the Creator has made nothing in vain) is most probably inhabited." "He found them asleep again; (for their eyes were heavy;) neither knew they what to answer him."

The parenthesis generally marks a moderate depression of the voice, and may be accompanied with every point which the sense would require, if the parenthetical characters were omitted. It ought to terminate with the

same kind of stop which the member has, that precedes it; and to contain that stop within the parenthetical marks*. We must, however, except cases of interrogation and exclamation: as, "While they wish to please, (and why should they not wish it?) they disdain dishonourable means." "It was represented by an analogy, (Oh, how inadequate!) which was borrowed from the religion of paganism."

---

* As the parenthesis includes the whole clause, and the point is a part of the clause, and properly belongs to it, there can be no doubt that the point should be contained *within* the parenthetical marks. To place it on the outside of the parenthetical characters, would be, to point those characters, and not the clause. The phrase which precedes the parenthesis should, doubtless, have its proper point and pause attached to it; and not be left without its necessary appendages till the parenthesis is completed: the suspense is forced and irregular. That the parenthesis itself does not supply the place of a point between the parenthetic clause, and the words immediately preceding it, is evident from this circumstance, that the preceding clause frequently requires a point and tone essentially different from those which belong to the parenthetic clause. This will be seen in the following sentence: "If I grant this request, (and who could refuse it?) I shall secure his esteem and attachment." The real and proper office of the parenthetical marks, is simply to denote, not a point, but the parenthetical clause.—We should not have so far extended this note, were it not that many writers, and some grammarians, are divided in their opinions and practice, on the subject.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE APOSTROPHE, CARET, &c.

THERE are other characters, which are frequently made use of in composition, and which may be explained in this place, viz.

An Apostrophe, marked thus ' is used to abbreviate or shorten a word: as, "*'tis* for *it is; tho'* for *though; e'en* for *even; judg'd* for *judged.* Its chief use is to show the genitive case of nouns: as, "A man's property; a woman's ornament."

A Caret, marked thus ‸ is placed where some word happens to be left out in writing, and which is inserted over the line. This mark is also called a circumflex, when placed over a particular vowel, to denote a long syllable: as, "Euphrâtes."

A Hyphen, marked thus - is employed in connecting compounded words: as, "Lap-dog, tea-pot, pre-existence, self-love, to-morrow, mother-in-law."

It is also used when a word is divided, and the former part is written or printed at the end of one line, and the latter part at the beginning of another. In this case, it is placed at the end of the first line, not at the beginning of the second.

The Acute Accent, marked thus ´: as, "*Fáncy.*" The Grave thus `: as, "*Fàvour.*"

In English, the accentual marks are chiefly used in spelling-books and dictionaries, to mark the syllables which require a particular stress of the voice in pronunciation.

The stress is laid on long and short syllables indiscriminately. In order to distinguish the one from the other, some writers of dictionaries have placed the grave on the former, and the acute on the latter, in this manner: "Mìnor, míneral, lìvely, líved, rìval, ríver."

The proper mark to distinguish a long syllable, is this ¯: as, "Rōsy:" and a short one this ˘: as, "Fŏlly." This last mark is called a breve.

A Diæresis, thus marked ¨, consists of two points placed over one of the two vowels that would otherwise make a diphthong, and parts them into two syllables: as, "Creätor, coädjutor, aërial."

A Section, marked thus §, is the division of a discourse, or chapter, into less parts or portions.

A Paragraph ¶ denotes the beginning of a new subject, or a sentence not connected with the foregoing. This character is chiefly used in the Old, and in the New Testaments.

A Quotation " ". Two inverted commas are generally placed at the beginning of a phrase or a passage, which is quoted or transcribed from the speaker or author in his own words; and two commas in their direct position, are placed at the conclusion: as,

"The proper study of mankind is man."

Crotchets or Brackets [] serve to enclose a word or sentence, which is to be explained in a note, or the explanation itself, or a word or sentence which is intended to supply some deficiency, or to rectify some mistake.

An Index or Hand ☞ points out a remarkable passage, or something that requires particular attention.

A Brace } is used in poetry at the end of a triplet or three lines, which have the same rhyme.

Braces are also used to connect a number of words with one common term, and are introduced to prevent a repetition in writing or printing.

An Asterisk, or little star*, directs the reader to some note in the margin, or at the bottom of the page. Two or three asterisks generally denote the omission of some letters in a word, or of some bold or indelicate expression, or some defect in the manuscript.

An Ellipsis —— is also used, when some letters in a word, or some words in a verse, are omitted: as, "The k—g," for "the king."

An Obelisk, which is marked thus †, and Parallels thus ||, together with the letters of the Alphabet, and figures, are used as references to the margin, or bottom of the page.

CHAPTER VII.

DIRECTIONS RESPECTING THE USE OF CAPITAL LETTERS.

As THE commencement of every sentence is distinguished by a capital letter, and as capitals frequently occur in other parts of a sentence; it is necessary to give the learner some directions respecting their proper application.

It was formerly the custom to begin every noun with a capital: but as this practice was troublesome, and gave the writing or printing a crowded and confused appearance, it has been discontinued. It is, however, very proper to begin with a capital,

1. The first word of every book, chapter, letter, note, or any other piece of writing.

2. The first word after a period; and, if the two sentences are *totally independent*, after a note of interrogation or exclamation.

But if a number of interrogative or exclamatory sentences, are thrown into one general group; or if the construction of the latter sentences depends on the former, all of them, except the first, may begin with a small letter: as, "How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorners delight in their scorning? and fools hate knowledge?" "Alas! how different! yet how like the same!"

3. The appellations of the Diety: as, "God, Jehovah, the Almighty, the Supreme Being, the Lord, Providence the Messiah, the Holy Spirit."

4. Proper names of persons, places, streets, mountains, rivers, ships: as, "George, York, the Strand, the Alps, the Thames, the Seahorse."

5. Adjectives derived from the proper names of places: as, "Grecian, Roman, English, French, and Italian."

6. The first word of a quotation, introduced after a colon, or when it is in a direct form: as, "Always remember this ancient maxim: 'Know thyself.'" "Our great lawgiver says, 'Take up thy cross daily, and follow me.'" But when a quotation is brought in obliquely after a comma, a capital is unnecessary: as, "Solomon observes, 'that pride goes before destruction.'"

The first word of an example may also very properly begin with a capital: as, "Temptation proves our virtue."

7. Every substantive and principal word in the titles of books: as, "Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language;" "Thomson's Seasons;" "Rollin's Ancient History."

8. The first word of every line in poetry.

9. The pronoun *I*, and the Interjection *O*, are written in capitals: as, "I write:" "Hear, O earth!"

Other words, besides the preceding, may begin with capitals, when they are remarkably emphatical, or the principal subject of the composition.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF PARAGRAPHS.

As every species of composition admits of being divided into paragraphs, it appears to be proper to explain the nature and use of these divisions, more particularly than they have been explained in Chapter VI. page 412. The following rules on this subject will afford the student some instruction.

1. Different subjects, unless they are very short, or very numerous in small compass, should be separated into paragraphs.

2. When one subject is continued to a considerable length, the larger divisions of it should be put into paragraphs. And it will have a good effect to form the breaks, when it can properly be done, at sentiments of the most weight, or that call for particular attention.

3. The facts, premises, and conclusions, of a subject, sometimes naturally point out the separations into paragraphs: and each of these, when of great length, will again require subdivisions at their most distinctive parts. By showing the learner how some of these divisions may be introduced, he will more easily comprehend their nature. They may be expressed in the following manner, or in any other similar forms of expression.—" From this enumeration of particulars, it appears to follow, that," &c. " The natural consequence of this deduction of facts, is," &c. " The legitimate inference from these premises, seems to be," &c. " From the preceding statement, we are warranted in concluding," &c.

4. In cases which require a connected subject to be formed into several paragraphs, a suitable turn of expression, exhibiting the connexion of the broken parts, will give beauty and force to the division. This rule will be more intelligible to the student, by the following phrases, which point out, in a few instances, how separated paragraphs may be connected in sentiment. " This idea was, indeed, no more than conjecture: but it was confirmed by," &c. " What has been related is not, in itself, very important; but connected with subsequent facts, it has great weight," &c. " Happy as he appears to have been, in this situation, his felicity was augmented by another event: this was," &c. " These are the miseries of vice; let us now describe the happiness of virtue," &c.

In the following letter, some of the preceding rules respecting paragraphs, are distinctly exemplified: and we present it to the student, as an illustration and confirmation of those rules. To elucidate them all would require a greater number of pages, than can be properly assigned for that purpose in the present work.

" According to my promise, I now send you the fine sentiments of Addison, upon Gratitude. But before I exhibit this virtue, I shall present you with a few maxims and observations, which, to young persons in particular, are of great importance; and which I am persuaded will meet your most cordial approbation.

Time once past, never returns: the moment which is lost, is lost for ever.

He that waits for an opportunity to do much at once, may breathe out his life in idle wishes; and regret, in the last hour, his useless intentions, and barren zeal.

The best preparation for all the uncertainties of futurity, consists in a well-ordered mind, a good conscience, and a cheerful submission to the will of Heaven.

The appearances of our security are frequently deceitful. When our sky seems most settled and serene, in some unobserved quarter gathers the little black cloud, in which the tempest ferments, and prepares to discharge itself on our head.

To sensual persons, hardly any thing is what it appears to be: and what flatters most is always farthest from reality. There are voices which sing around them; but whose strains allure to ruin. There is a banquet spread, where poison is in every dish. There is a couch which invites them to repose; but to slumber upon it is death.

We should cherish sentiments of charity towards all men. The Author of all good nourishes much piety and virtue in hearts that are unknown to us; and beholds repentance ready to spring up among many, whom we consider as reprobates.

Let him that desires to see others happy, make haste to give while his gift can be enjoyed; and remember, that every moment of delay, takes away something from the value of his benefaction. And let him who proposes his own happiness reflect, that while he forms his purpose, the day rolls on, and 'the night cometh, when no man can work.'

There is certainly no greater felicity, than to be able to look back on a life usefully and virtuously employed; to trace our own progress in existence, by such tokens as excite neither shame nor sorrow. It ought therefore to be the care of those, who wish to pass the last hours with comfort, to lay up such a treasure of pleasing ideas, as shall support the expenses of that time, which is to depend wholly upon the fund already acquired.

THE beautiful piece of Addison, on the duty and pleasure of being grateful to our benefactors, is as follows.

'There is not (says he) a more pleasing exercise of the mind, than gratitude. It is accompanied with so great inward satisfaction, that the duty is sufficiently rewarded by the performance. It is not, like the practice of many other virtues, difficult and painful; but attended with so much pleasure, that were there no positive command which enjoined it, nor any recompense laid up for it hereafter, a generous mind would indulge in it, for the natural gratification it affords.

If gratitude is due from man to man, how much more from man to his Maker?—The Supreme Being does not only confer upon us those bounties, which proceed more immediately from his hand, but even those benefits which are conveyed to us by others. Every blessing we enjoy, by what means soever it may be derived upon us, is the gift of HIM, who is the great author of good, and the Father of mercies.

If gratitude, when exerted towards one another, naturally produces a very pleasing sensation in the mind of a grateful man, it exalts the soul into rapture, when it is employed on this great object of gratitude; on this beneficent Being, who has given us every thing we already possess, and from whom we expect every thing we yet hope for.'

I hope that the maxims and observations, and the sentiments on gratitude, which are contained in this letter, will be considered by you of so much importance, as to be worthy of being impressed on your memory.

Yours most affectionately."

CONCLUSION.

HAVING finished the present Treatise on the several parts of Grammar, we shall conclude this portion of our work, with expressing a few sentiments, in vindication of the subject and labours in which we have been engaged. These sentiments have been principally taken from Harris's Hermes.

An objector to this system of grammatical rules and principles, may demand, with an air of pleasantry and ridicule,—"Is there no speaking then without all this trouble? Do we not all converse together without difficulty, and clearly communicate our ideas; not only the learned, but the unlearned, not only profound philosophers, but also poor and simple peasants?" We may answer, by interrogating on our part; Do not those same poor peasants use the Lever and the Wedge, and many other instruments, with much habitual readiness? And yet have they any conception of those geometrical principles, from which those machines derive their efficacy and force? And is the ignorance of these peasants a reason for others to remain ignorant; or to render the subject a less becoming inquiry? Think of animals, and vegetables, that occur every day; of time, of place, and of motion; of light, of colours, and of gravitation; of our very senses and intellect, by which we perceive every thing else: *that they are*, we all know, and are perfectly satisfied; *what* they are, is a subject of much obscurity

and doubt. Were we to reject this last question, because we are certain of the first position, we should banish all philosophy at once out of the world.

But a graver objector now accosts us. "What (says he) is the *utility?* Whence the *profit*, where the *gain?*" Every science whatever (we may answer) has its use. Arithmetic is excellent for the guaging of liquors; geometry, for the measuring of estates; astronomy, for the making of almanacks; and grammar, perhaps, for the drawing of bonds and conveyances.

Thus much to the *Interested.* If the *Liberal* ask for something better than this, we may answer and assure them, from the best authorities, that every exercise of the mind upon theorems of science, like generous and manly exercise of the body, tends to call forth and strengthen nature's original vigour. Be the subject immediately lucrative, or not, the nerves of reason are braced by the mere employ; and we become abler actors in the drama of life, whether our part be of the busier, or of the sedater kind.

Perhaps too, there is a pleasure, even in science itself, distinct from any end, to which it may be farther conducive. Are not health and strength of *body*, desirable for their own sakes, though we happen not to be destined for porters or draymen? And have not health and strength of *mind* their intrinsic worth also, though not assigned to the pursuits of emolument? Why should there not be a good, (could we have the virtue to recognise it,) in the *mere energy* of our intellect, as much as in energies of lower degree?

If there be supposed then a pleasure, a satisfaction, a good, a something valuable for itself without a view

to any thing farther, in so many objects of the *subordinate* kind, shall we not allow the same praise to the *sublime* objects of the mind? Shall the intellect alone feel no pleasures in its energy, when we allow them to the gross energies of appetite and sense? Whatever may be urged in behalf of the enjoyments of the senses, we may safely affirm of *intellectual good*, that it is the *good* of that part, which is most excellent within us; that it is a good accommodated to all places and times; which neither depends on the will of others, nor on the affluence of external fortune; that it is a good which decays not with decaying appetites, but often rises in vigour, when those are no more.

But assuredly, when our enjoyments and powers, whether of the senses, the imagination, or the understanding, are contemplated with gratitude to their Author, the Giver of all Good, and employed to promote his will and our own final well being, they answer, in the highest degree, the end for which they were granted to us. By these means, they become blessings truly improved, ennobled, and sanctified.

APPENDIX:

CONTAINING

RULES AND OBSERVATIONS,

FOR ASSISTING YOUNG PERSONS

TO WRITE

WITH PERSPICUITY AND ACCURACY.

To be studied

AFTER THEY HAVE ACQUIRED

A COMPETENT KNOWLEDGE

OF

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

"Non solum ut intelligere possit, sed ne omnino possit non intelligere, "curandum." .... *Quinctilian.*

APPENDIX.

PERSPICUITY is the fundamental quality of style: a quality so essential in every kind of writing, that for the want of it nothing can atone. It is not to be considered as merely a sort of negative virtue, or freedom from defect. It has higher merit: it is a degree of positive beauty. We are pleased with an author, and consider him as deserving praise, who frees us from all fatigue of searching for his meaning; who carries us through his subject without any embarrassment or confusion; whose style flows always like a limpid stream, through which we see to the very bottom.

Authors sometimes plead the difficulty of their subject, as an excuse for the want of perspicuity. But the excuse can rarely, if ever, be admitted. For whatever a man conceives clearly, he may, if he will be at the trouble, put it into distinct

propositions, and express it clearly to others: and upon no subject ought any man to write, where he cannot think clearly. His ideas may, very excusably, be on some subjects incomplete or inadequate: but still, as far as they go, they ought to be clear; and wherever this is the case, Perspicuity, in expressing them, is always attainable.

The study of perspicuity and accuracy of expression, consists of Three Parts: and requires attention, First, to *Single Words and Phrases*; Secondly, to the *Construction of Sentences*; and Thirdly, to the *Great Principle which decides the propriety of language*. If words are properly chosen, correctly arranged, and conformable to present established usage, it is impossible that the sense can be ambiguous.

PART I.

Of Perspicuity and Accuracy of Expression,

With respect to Single Words and Phrases.

THESE qualities of style, considered with regard to words and phrases, require the following properties:

PURITY,
PROPRIETY,
AND
PRECISION*.

---

* Purity requires that those words only shall be employed, which are of classical authority: Propriety, that, of classical words, those shall always be selected, which are best adapted to express the meaning: Precision, that no more words shall be introduced, than are necessary to convey the sense. Classical authority consists of speakers and writers, who are deservedly in high estimation: speakers, distinguished for their elocution, and persuasive eloquence; writers, eminent for correct taste, solid matter, and refined manner.

CHAPTER I.

OF PURITY.

See Vol. II. page 199.

PURITY of style consists in the use of such words, and such constructions, as belong to the idiom of the language which we speak; in opposition to words and phrases that are taken from other languages, or that are ungrammatical, obsolete, new-coined, or used without proper authority. All such words and phrases as the following, should be avoided: *Quoth he; I wist not; erewhile; behest; self-same; delicatesse*, for delicacy; *politesse*, for politeness; *hauteur*, for haughtiness; *incumberment, connexity, martyrised*, for encumbrance, connexion, martyred.

Foreign and learned words, unless where necessity requires them, should never be admitted into our composition. Barren languages may need such assistance, but ours is not one of these. A multitude of Latin words, in particular, have, of late, been poured in upon our language. On some occasions, they give an appearance of elevation and dignity to style; but they often render it stiff and apparently forced. In general, a plain, native style, is more intelligible to all readers; and, by a proper management of words, it can be made as strong and expressive as this Latinised English, or any foreign idioms.

CHAPTER II.

OF PROPRIETY.

See Vol. II. page 202.

PROPRIETY of language, is the selection of such words as the best usage has appropriated to those ideas, which we intend to express by them; in opposition to low expressions, and to words and phrases which would be less significant of the ideas that we mean to convey. Style may be pure, that is, it may be strictly English, without Scotticisms or Gallicisms, or ungrammatical, irregular expressions of any kind, and may, nevertheless, be deficient in propriety: for the words may be ill chosen, not adapted to the subject, nor fully expressive of the author's sense.

To preserve propriety, therefore, in our words and phrases, we must avoid *low expressions; supply words that are wanting;* be careful not to *use the same word in different senses;* avoid *the injudicious use of technical phrases, equivocal or ambiguous words, unintelligible expressions, and all such words and phrases as are not adapted to our meaning.*

1. Avoid *low expressions:* such as, "Topsy turvy, hurly burly, pellmell; having a month's mind for a thing; currying favour with a person; dancing attendance on the great," &c.

"Meantime the Britons, left to shift for themselves, were forced to call in the Saxons for their defence." The phrase, "*left to shift for themselves,*" is rather a low phrase, and too much in the familiar style to be proper in a grave treatise.

2. *Supply words that are wanting.* "Arbitrary power I look upon as a greater evil than anarchy itself, as much as a savage is a happier state of life, than a slave at the oar:" it should have been, "as much as *the state* of a savage, is happier than *that* of a slave at the oar." "He has not treated this subject liberally, by the views of others as well as his own;" "By *adverting* to the views of others," would have been better. "This generous action greatly increased his former services;" it should have been, "greatly increased *the merit* of his former services." "By the pleasures of the imagination or fancy, (which I shall use promiscuously,) I here mean," &c. This passage ought to have had the word "terms" supplied, which would have made it correct: "*terms* which I shall use promiscuously."

It may be proper in this place to observe, that articles and prepositions are sometimes improperly omitted; as in the following instances: "How immense the difference between the pious and profane!" "Death is the common lot of all: of good men and bad." They should have had the article and preposition repeated: "How immense the difference between *the* pious and *the* profane!" "Death is the common lot of all; *of* good men and *of* bad."

The repetition of articles and prepositions is proper, when we intend to point out the objects of which we speak, as distinguished from each other, or in contrast: and when we wish that the reader's attention should rest on that distinction: as, "Our sight is at once *the* most delightful, and *the* most useful of all our senses."

3. *In the same sentence, be careful not to use the same word too frequently, nor in different senses.* "One may have an air *which* proceeds from a just sufficiency and

knowledge of the matter before him, *which* may naturally produce some motions of his head and body, *which* might become the bench better than the bar."

The pronoun *which* is here thrice used, in such a manner as to throw obscurity over the sentence.

"Gregory favoured the undertaking, for no other reason than this, that the manager, in countenance, favoured his friend." It should have been, "resembled his friend."

"Charity expands our hearts in love to God and man: it is by the virtue of charity that the rich are blessed, and the poor supplied." In this sentence, the word "charity" is improperly used in two different senses; for the highest benevolence, and for almsgiving.

4. *Avoid the injudicious use of technical terms.* To inform those who do not understand sea-phrases, that, "We tacked to the larboard, and stood off to sea," would be expressing ourselves very obscurely. Technical phrases not being in current use, but only the peculiar dialect of a particular class, we should never use them but when we know they will be understood.

5. *Avoid equivocal or ambiguous words.* The following sentences are exceptionable in this respect. "As for such animals as are *mortal* or noxious, we have a right to destroy them." "I long since learned to like nothing but what you *do*." "He aimed at *nothing less* than the crown," may denote either, "Nothing was less aimed at by him than the crown," or, "Nothing inferior to the crown could satisfy his ambition." "*I will have mercy*, and not sacrifice." The first part of this sentence denotes, "I will exercise mercy;" whereas it is in this place employed to signify, "I require others to exercise it." The translation should therefore have been accommodated to these different meanings. "They were both much more ancient among the

Persians, than Zoroaster *or* Zerdusht." The *or* in this sentence is equivocal. It serves either as a copulative to synonymous words, or as a disjunctive of different things. If, therefore, the student should not know, that Zoroaster and Zerdusht mean the same person, he will mistake the sense. "The rising tomb a lofty column bore:" "And thus the son the fervent sire addressed." Did the tomb bear the column, or the column the tomb? Did the son address the sire, or the sire the son?

If the sire addressed the son, the line should run thus;

"And thus his son the fervent sire address'd."

If the son addressed the sire;

"And thus the son his fervent sire address'd."

When we say; "Neither life nor death shall separate us from the love of God;" it may mean, either from the love which we owe to God, or the love which he bears to us: for "The love of God" may denote, either the relation which the affection bears to its subject, or that which it bears to its object.

An ambiguity likewise arises, from expressing either the relation of the effect to its cause, or that of the accident to its subject: as, "This event took place a little after the reformation of Luther." This sentence may import, either the change produced *by* Luther, or a change produced *in* him. The latter indeed is the meaning, according to the construction of the phrase; though it is not that which was intended by the author. He should have said, "the reformation *by* Luther."

6. *Avoid unintelligible and inconsistent words or phrases.* "I have observed," says Steele, "that the superiority among these coffeehouse politicians, proceeds from an

opinion of gallantry and fashion." This sentence, considered in itself, evidently conveys no meaning. First, it is not said whose opinion, their own, or that of others: Secondly, it is not said what opinion, or of what sort, favourable or unfavourable, true or false; but in general, "an opinion of gallantry and fashion," which contains no definite expression of any meaning. With the joint assistance of the context, reflexion, and conjecture, we shall perhaps conclude that the author intended to say; "That the rank among these politicians, was determined by the opinion generally entertained of the rank, in point of gallantry and fashion, that each of them had attained."

"This temper of mind," says an author, speaking of humility, "keeps our understanding tight about us." Whether the author had any meaning in this expression, or what it was, is not easy to determine.

Sometimes a writer runs on in a specious verbosity, amusing his reader with synonymous terms and identical propositions, well-turned periods, and high sounding words; but at the same time, using those words so indefinitely, that the reader can either affix no meaning at all to them, or may affix to them almost any meaning he pleases.

"If it is asked," says a late writer, "whence arises the harmony or beauty of language? what are the rules for obtaining it? the answer is obvious. Whatever renders a period sweet and pleasant, makes it also graceful. A good ear is the gift of nature; it may be much improved, but not acquired by art. Whoever is possessed of it, will scarcely need dry critical precepts, to enable him to judge of a true rhythmus, and melody of composition. Just numbers, accurate proportions, a musical symphony, magnificent figures, and that decorum which is the result of all these, are unison to the human mind."

The following is a poetical example of the same nature, in which there is scarcely a glimpse of meaning, though it was composed by an eminent poet.

From harmony, from heavenly harmony,
This universal frame began:
From harmony to harmony
Thro' all the compass of the notes it ran,
The diapason closing full in man.

In general, it may be said, that in writings of this stamp, we must accept of sound instead of sense; being assured, that if we meet with little that can inform the judgment, we shall at least find nothing that will offend the ear. And perhaps this is one reason that we pass over such smooth language, without suspecting that it contains little or no meaning. In order to write or speak clearly and intelligibly, two things are especially requisite: one, that we have clear and distinct ideas of our subject; and the other, that our words be approved signs of those ideas. That persons who think confusedly, should express themselves obscurely, is not to be wondered at; for embarrassed, obscure, and feeble sentences, are generally, if not always, the result of embarrassed, obscure, and feeble thought: but that persons of judgment, who are accustomed to scrutinize their ideas, and the signification of their words, should sometimes write without any meaning, is, at first sight, matter of admiration. This, however, when further considered, appears to be an effect derived from the same cause, indistinctness of conception, and inattention to the exact import of words.—The occasions on which we are most apt to speak and write in this unintelligible manner, are the three following.

The *first* is, where there is an exuberance of metaphor. Writers who are fond of the metaphoric style, are generally disposed to continue it too long, and to pursue it

too far. They are often misled, by a desire of flourishing on the several properties of a metaphor, which they have ushered into the discourse, without taking the trouble to examine whether there are any qualities in the subject, to which these properties can, with justice and perspicuity, be applied. The following instance of this sort of writing, is from an author of considerable eminence. "Men must acquire a very peculiar and strong habit of turning their view inward, in order to explore the interior regions and recesses of the mind, the hollow caverns of deep thought, the private seats of fancy, and the wastes and wildernesses, as well as the more fruitful and cultivated tracts of this obscure climate." A most wonderful way of telling us, that it is difficult to trace the operations of the mind. The author having determined to represent the human mind under the metaphor of a country, revolved in his thoughts the various objects which might be found in a country, without considering whether there are any things in the mind properly analogous to these. Hence the strange parade he makes with *regions* and *recesses*, *hollow caverns* and *private seats*, *wastes* and *wildernesses*, *fruitful* and *cultivated tracts;* words which, though they have a precise meaning, as applied to country, have no definite signification, as applied to mind.

The *second* occasion of our being apt to write unintelligibly, is that wherein the terms most frequently occurring, denote things which are of a complicated nature, and to which the mind is not sufficiently familiarised. Of these the instances are numberless, in every tongue; such as, Government, church, state, constitution, power, legislature, jurisdiction, &c.

The *third* and principal occasion of unintelligible writing, is, when the terms employed are very abstract, and consequently of very extensive signification. Thus the word *lion* is more distinctly apprehended by the mind, than the word *beast*, *beast* than *animal*, and *animal* than *being*.

The 7th and last rule for preserving propriety in our words and phrases, is, *to avoid all those which are not adapted to the ideas we mean to communicate; or which are less significant than others, of those ideas.* "He feels any sorrow that can *arrive at* man;" better "*happen to* man." "The *conscience* of approving one's self a benefactor, is the best recompense for being so;" it should have been "*consciousness.*" "He firmly believed the divine *precept,* 'There is not a sparrow falls to the ground,'" &c. It should have been "*doctrine.*"

"It is but opening the eye, and the scene enters." A *scene* cannot be said *to enter:* an *actor* enters; but a scene *appears* or *presents itself.*

"We immediately assent to the beauty of an object, without inquiring into the causes of it:" it is proper to say, that we *assent* to the truth of a proposition; but it cannot so well be said, that we *assent to the beauty of an object.* *Acknowledge* would have expressed the sense with propriety.

"The sense of feeling, can, indeed, give us a notion of extension, shape, *and all other ideas* that enter at the eye, except colours." *Extension* and *shape* can, with no propriety, be called *ideas;* they are properties of matter. Neither is it accurate, to speak of any sense *giving us a notion of ideas:* our senses give us the ideas themselves. The meaning of the sentence would have been proper, and much clearer, if the author had expressed himself thus: "The sense of feeling, can, indeed, give us the idea of extension, figure, and all the other properties of matter, which are perceived by the eye, except colours."

"The covetous man never has a sufficiency; although he has what is enough for nature," is much inferior to, "The covetous man never has *enough;* although he has what is *sufficient* for nature."

"A traveller observes the most striking objects he sees; a general remarks all the motions of his enemy:"

better thus: "A traveller *remarks*," &c.; "A general *observes*," &c.

"This measure enlarged his school, and obliged him to increase the buildings;" it should be, "*increased* his school;" and "*enlarge* the buildings."

"He applied a medicine before the poison had time to work;" better thus: "He applied an *antidote*," &c.

"The poison of a suspicious temper frequently throws out its bad qualities, on all who are within its reach;" better, "throws out its *malignant* qualities."

"I will go except I should be ill;" "I saw them all unless two or three:" corrected thus: "*unless* I should be ill;" "*except* two or three."

A selection of words and phrases, which are peculiarly expressive of the ideas we design to communicate; or which are as particular and determinate in their signification, as is consistent with the nature and the scope of the discourse; possesses great beauty, and cannot fail to produce a good effect.

CHAPTER III.

OF PRECISION.

See Vol. II. p. 212.

PRECISION is the third requisite of perspicuity with respect to words and phrases. It signifies retrenching superfluities, and pruning the expression, so as to exhibit neither more nor less, than an exact copy of the person's idea who uses it.

The words used to express ideas may be faulty in three respects. First, they may not express the idea which the author intends, but some other which only resembles it: secondly, They may express that idea, but not fully and completely: thirdly, They may express it, together with something more than is intended. Precision stands opposed to these three faults, but chiefly to the last. Propriety implies a freedom from the two former faults. The words which are used may be *proper;* that is, they may express the idea intended, and they may express it fully: but to be *precise*, signifies that they express *that idea, and no more.*

The use and importance of precision, may be deduced from the nature of the human mind. It never can view, clearly and distinctly, more than one object at a time. If it must look at two or three together, especially objects that have resemblance or connexion, it finds itself confused and embarrassed. It cannot clearly perceive, in what they agree, and in what they differ. Thus, were any object, suppose some animal, to be presented to my view, of whose structure I wished to form a distinct notion, I should desire all its trappings to be taken off, I should require it to be brought before me by itself, and to stand alone, that there might be nothing to divide my

attention. The same is the case with words. If, when any one would inform me of his meaning, he also tells me more than what conveys it; if he joins foreign circumstances to the principal objects; if, by unnecessarily varying the expression, he shifts the point of view, and makes me see sometimes the object itself, and sometimes another thing that is connected with it; he thereby obliges me to look on several objects at once, and I lose sight of the principal. He loads the animal he is showing me, with so many trappings and collars, that I cannot distinctly view it; or he brings so many of the same species before me, somewhat resembling, and yet somewhat differing, that I see none of them clearly. When an author tells me of his hero's courage in the day of battle, the expression is precise, and I understand it fully: but if, from the desire of multiplying words, he should praise his courage and fortitude; at the moment he joins these words together, my idea begins to waver. He means to express one quality more strongly, but he is in truth expressing two: courage resists danger; fortitude supports pain. The occasion of exerting each of these qualities, is different; and being led to think of both together, when only one of them should be considered, my view is rendered unsteady, and my conception of the object indistinct.

All subjects do not equally require precision. It is sufficient, on many occasions, that we have a general view of the meaning. The subject, perhaps, is of the known and familiar kind, and we are in no hazard of mistaking the sense of the author, though every word which he uses is not precise and exact.

Many authors offend against this rule of *precision*. A respectable one, in describing a bad action, expresses himself thus: " It is to remove a good and orderly affection, and to introduce an ill or disorderly one; to commit an action that is ill, immoral, and unjust; to do ill, or to act in prejudice of integrity, good nature, and worth."

A crowd of unmeaning or useless words is brought together by some authors, who, afraid of expressing themselves in a common and ordinary manner, and allured by an appearance of splendour, surround every thing which they mean to say, with a certain copious loquacity.

The great source of a loose style, in opposition to precision, is the injudicious use of the words termed *synonymous*. They are called synonymous, because they agree in expressing one principal idea; but for the most part, if not always, they express it with some diversity in the circumstances.

The following instances show a difference in the meaning of words reputed synonymous; and point out the use of attending, with care and strictness, to the exact import of words.

Custom, habit.—Custom, respects the action; habit, the actor. By custom, we mean the frequent repetition of the same act: by habit, the effect which that repetition produces on the mind or body. By the custom of walking often in the streets, one acquires a habit of idleness.

Pride, vanity.—Pride makes us esteem ourselves; vanity, makes us desire the esteem of others. It is just to say, that a man is too proud to be vain.

Haughtiness, disdain.—Haughtiness is founded on the high opinion we entertain of ourselves; disdain, on the low opinion we have of others.

Only, alone.—Only, imports that there is no other of the same kind; alone, imports being accompanied by no other. An only child, is one that has neither brother nor sister: a child alone, is one who is left by itself. There is a difference, therefore, in precise language, between these two phrases: "Virtue only makes us happy;" and "Virtue alone makes us happy."

Wisdom, prudence.—Wisdom leads us to speak and act what is most proper. Prudence, prevents our speaking or acting improperly.

Entire, complete.—A thing is entire, by wanting none of its parts: complete, by wanting none of the appendages that belong to it. A man may have an entire house to himself, and yet not have one complete apartment.

Surprised, astonished, amazed, confounded.—I am surprised with what is new or unexpected; I am astonished at what is vast or great; I am amazed at what is incomprehensible; I am confounded by what is shocking or terrible.

Tranquillity, peace, calm.—Tranquillity, respects a situation free from trouble, considered in itself; peace, the same situation with respect to any causes that might interrupt it; calm, with regard to a disturbed situation going before or following it. A good man enjoys tranquillity, in himself; peace, with others; and calm, after the storm.

These are some of the numerous instances of words, in our language, whose significations approach, but are not precisely the same. The more the distinction in the meaning of such words, is attended to, the more clearly and forcibly shall we speak or write. It may not, on all occasions, be necessary to pay a great deal of attention to very nice distinctions; yet the foregoing instances show the utility of some general care, to understand the distinct import of our words.

While we are attending to precision, we must be on our guard, lest, from the desire of pruning too closely, we retrench all copiousness. Scarcely in any language are there two words that convey precisely the same idea; a person thoroughly conversant in the propriety of the

language, will always be able to observe something that distinguishes them. As they are like different shades of the same colour, an accurate writer can employ them to great advantage, by using them so as to heighten and complete the object which he presents to us. He supplies by one what was wanting in the other, to the strength, or to the finishing, of the image which he means to exhibit. But, for this purpose, he must be attentive to the choice of his words, and not employ them carelessly, merely for the sake of filling up a period, or of rounding or diversifying his language, as if their signification were exactly the same, while in truth it is not. To unite copiousness and precision, to be full and easy, and at the same time correct and exact in the choice of every word, is, no doubt, one of the highest and most difficult attainments in writing.

PART II.

Of Perspicuity and Accuracy of Expression,

With respect to the construction of Sentences.

WE have finished the discussion of perspicuity and accuracy of expression, as far as they relate to the materials of language, the purity, propriety, and precision of words. It remains that we consider them, with regard to the construction of these materials, or the disposition of words in sentences and periods. Hitherto we have investigated the nature of words and phrases detached and unconnected, in the same manner as an architect selects and prepares the materials of an edifice. We are now, like the same artist, to delineate the plan of execution, or to point out the most proper conjunction of the materials, to accomplish the end in view. As the best materials for building will not form a convenient and elegant habitation, unless they are adjusted on a proper plan, so the purest and best chosen words will not constitute a perspicuous and beautiful sentence, unless they are well applied and properly arranged.

Sentences, in general, should neither be very long, nor very short: long ones require close attention to make us clearly perceive the connexion of the several parts; and short ones are apt to break the sense, and weaken the connexion of thought. Yet occasionally they may both be used with force and propriety; as may be seen in the following sentences.

"If you look about you, and consider the lives of others as well as your own; if you think how few are born with honour, and how many die without name or children;

how little beauty we see, and how few friends we hear of; how much poverty, and how many diseases there are in the world; you will fall down upon your knees, and instead of repining at one affliction, will admire so many blessings which you have received from the Divine hand." This is a sentence composed of several members linked together, and hanging upon one another, so that the sense of the whole is not brought out till the close. The following is an example of one in which the sense is formed into short, independent propositions, each complete within itself. "I confess, it was want of consideration that made me an author. I wrote because it amused me. I corrected, because it was as pleasant to me to correct, as to write. I published, because I was told I might please such as it was a credit to please."

A train of sentences, constructed in the same manner, and with the same number of members, should never be allowed to succeed one another. A protracted succession of either long or short sentences, or of sentences of the same length, should also be avoided; for the ear tires of such expressions, when they are too long continued. Whereas, by a proper mixture of long and short periods, and of periods variously constructed, not only the ear is gratified, but animation and force are given to our style. A very frequent succession of words or phrases, in couplets, or triplets, is also a great blemish in composition.

We now proceed to consider the things most essential to an accurate and a perfect sentence. They appear to be the four following:

1. CLEARNESS.
2. UNITY.
3. STRENGTH.
4. A JUDICIOUS USE OF THE FIGURES OF SPEECH.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE CLEARNESS OF A SENTENCE.

See Vol. II. p. 214.

THE FIRST requisite of a perfect sentence, is *Clearness*.

Whatever leaves the mind in any sort of suspense as to the meaning, ought to be avoided. Obscurity arises from two causes; either from a wrong choice of words, or a wrong arrangement of them. The choice of words and phrases, as far as regards perspicuity, has been already considered. The disposition of them comes now under consideration.

The first thing to be studied here, is grammatical propriety. But as the grammar of our language is comparatively not extensive, there may be an obscure order of words, where there is no transgression of any grammatical rule. The relations of words, or members of a period, are, with us, ascertained only by the position in which they stand.

Hence a capital rule in the arrangement of sentences is, that the words or members, most clearly related, should be placed in the sentence as near to each other as possible, so as to make their mutual relation clearly appear. It will be proper to produce some instances, in order to show the importance of this rule.

1. *In the position of adverbs.* "The Romans understood liberty, *at least*, as well as we." These words are capable of two different senses, according as the emphasis, in reading them, is laid upon *liberty*, or upon *at least*. The words should have been thus arranged: "The Romans understood liberty as well, at least, as we."

"Theism can only be opposed to polytheism, or atheism." Is it meant that theism is capable of nothing else besides being opposed to polytheism, or atheism? This is what the words literally import, through the wrong placing of the adverb *only*. It should have been, "Theism can be opposed only to polytheism or atheism."

"By the pleasures of the imagination, I mean only such pleasures as arise originally from sight." When it is said, "*I mean only such pleasures*," it may be remarked, that the adverb *only* is not properly placed. It is not intended here to qualify the word *mean*, but *such pleasures*; and therefore should have been placed in as close connexion as possible, with the word which it limits or qualifies. The style becomes more clear and neat, when the words are arranged thus: "By the pleasures of the imagination, I mean such pleasures only as arise from sight."

In the following sentence, the word *more* is not in its proper place. "There is not perhaps, any real beauty or deformity *more* in one piece of matter than another." The phrase ought to have stood thus: "Beauty or deformity in one piece of matter, more than in another."

2. *In the position of circumstances, and of particular members.*

The following passage, taken from Blackstone's Commentary on the laws of England, exhibits a number of depending circumstances distinctly and advantageously arranged. He is writing concerning the origin of civil power. "This is what is meant by the original contract of society, which, though it has, perhaps, in no instance, ever been formally expressed at the first institution of a state, yet, in nature and reason, should always be understood, in every act of associating together." In this instance, the original contract of society, is the principal

idea, and appears, with propriety, as the first and leading part of the sentence: "This is what is meant by the original contract of society." The action or verb "expressed," is limited by two circumstances, namely, "in no instance," and "at the first institution of a state." The former of these circumstances is placed before the verb, and the latter after it, in a manner perfectly analogous to the position of two adverbs attending on the same verb; viz. "which contract, though perhaps it has, in no instance, been formally expressed, at the first institution of a state." The second verb or action of the sentence, namely, "understood," is attended also by two circumstances, viz. "in nature and in reason," and, "in every act of associating together;" which circumstances are arranged in the same manner, and upon the same principle, as those in the former part of the sentence, namely, one before, and the other after, the action; thus: "yet, in nature and in reason, should always be understood, in every act of associating together."

An author, in his dissertation on parties, thus obscurely and irregularly expresses himself: "Are these designs which any man, who is born a Briton, in any circumstances, in any situation, ought to be ashamed or afraid to avow?" Here we are left at a loss, whether these words, "in any circumstances, in any situation," are connected with "a man born in Briton, in any circumstances or situation," or with that man's "avowing his designs in any circumstances or situation into which he may be brought." As it is probable that the latter was intended, the arrangement ought to have been conducted thus: "Are these designs which any man, who is born a Briton, ought to be ashamed or afraid, in any situation, in any circumstances, to avow?"

The following is another instance of a wrong arrangement of circumstances. "A great stone that I happened

to find, after a long search, by the sea shore, served me for an anchor." One would think that the search was confined to the sea shore; but as the meaning is, that the great stone was found by the sea shore, the period ought to have run thus: "A great stone, that, after a long search, I happened to find by the sea shore, served me for an anchor."

It is a rule, too, never to crowd many circumstances together, but rather to intersperse them in different parts of the sentence, joined with the principal words on which they depend. For instance: "What I had the opportunity of mentioning to my friend, sometime ago, in conversation, was not a new thought." These two circumstances, "*sometime ago*," and "*in conversation*," which are here put together, would have had a better effect disjoined, thus: "What I had the opportunity, sometime ago, of mentioning to my friend, in conversation, was not a new thought."

Here follows an example of the wrong arrangement of a member of a sentence. "The minister of state who grows less by his elevation, like a little statue placed on a mighty pedestal, will always have his jealousy strong about him." Here, so far as can be gathered from the arrangement, it is doubtful whether the object introduced, by way of simile, relates to what goes before, or to what follows. The ambiguity is removed by the following order. "The minister of state who, like a little statue placed on a mighty pedestal, grows less by his elevation, will always," &c.

Words expressing things connected in the thought, ought to be placed as near together as possible, even when their separation would convey no ambiguity. This will be seen in the following passages from Addison. "For the English are naturally fanciful, and very often disposed, by that gloominess and melancholy of temper, which are so frequent in our nation, to many wild notions and extravagan-

cies, to which others are not so liable." Here the verb or assertion is, by a pretty long circumstance, separated from the subject to which it refers. This might have been easily prevented, by placing the circumstance before the verb, thus: "For the English are naturally fanciful, and, by that gloominess and melancholy of temper which are so frequent in our nation, are often disposed to many wild notions," &c.

"For as no mortal author, in the ordinary fate and vicissitude of things, knows to what use his works may, some time or other, be applied," &c. Better thus: "For as, in the ordinary fate and vicissitude of things, no mortal author knows to what use, some time or other, his works may be applied," &c.

From these examples, the following observations will occur: that a circumstance ought never to be placed between two capital members of a period; but either between the parts of a member to which it belongs, or in such a manner as will confine it to its proper member. When the sense admits it, the sooner a circumstance is introduced, generally speaking, the better, that the more important and significant words may possess the last place, quite disencumbered. The following sentence is, in this respect, faulty. "The emperor was so intent on the establishment of his absolute power in Hungary, that he exposed the empire doubly to desolation and ruin for the sake of it." Better thus: "That, for the sake of it, he exposed the empire doubly to desolation and ruin."

This appears to be a proper place to observe, that when different things have an obvious relation to each other, in respect to the order of nature or time, that order should be regarded, in assigning them their places in the sentence; unless the scope of the passages require it to be varied. The conclusion of the following lines is inaccurate, in this respect: "But still there will be such a

mixture of delight, as is proportioned to the degree in which any one of these qualifications is most conspicuous and prevailing." The order in which the two last words are placed, should have been reversed, and made to stand, *prevailing* and *conspicuous.*—They are *conspicuous*, because they *prevail.*

The following sentence is a beautiful example of strict conformity to this rule. " Our sight fills the mind with the largest variety of ideas, converses with its objects at the greatest distance, and continues the longest in action, without being tired or satiated with its proper enjoyments." This passage follows the order of nature. First, we have the variety of objects mentioned, which sight furnishes to the mind; next, we have the action of sight on those objects; and lastly, we have the time and continuance of its action. No order could be more natural or exact.

The order which we now recommend, is, in single words especially, frequently violated, for the sake of better sound; but, perhaps, in no instances, without a deviation from the line of strict propriety.

3. *In the disposition of the relative pronouns,* who, which, what, whose, *and of all those particles which express the connexion of the parts of speech with one another.*

A small error, in the position of these words, may cloud the meaning of the whole sentence; and even where the meaning is intelligible, we always find something awkward and disjointed in the structure of the sentence, when these relatives are out of their proper place. " This kind of wit," says an author, " was very much in vogue among our *countrymen*, about an age or two ago; *who* did not practise it for any oblique reason, but purely for the sake of being witty." We are at no loss about the meaning here; but the construction would evidently be mended by

disposing the circumstance, "about an age or two ago," in such a manner as not to separate the relative *who*, from its antecedent *our countrymen;* in this way: "About an age or two ago, this kind of wit was very much in vogue among our countrymen, who did not practise it," &c.

The following passage is still more censurable. "It is folly to pretend to arm ourselves against the accidents of life, by heaping up treasures, *which* nothing can protect us against, but the good providence of our Creator." *Which* always refers grammatically to the substantive immediately preceding; and that, in the instance just mentioned, is "treasures." The sentence ought to have stood thus: "It is folly to pretend, by heaping up treasures, to arm ourselves against the accidents of life, which nothing can protect us against," &c.

With regard to relatives, it may be farther observed, that obscurity often arises from the too frequent repetition of them, particularly of the pronouns *who* and *they*, and *them* and *theirs*, when we have occasion to refer to different persons; as in the following sentence of Tillotson. "Men look with an evil eye upon the good that is in others, and think, that *their* reputation obscures *them*, and *their* commendable qualities stand in *their* light; and therefore *they* do what *they* can to cast a cloud over *them*, that the bright shining of *their* virtues may not obscure *them*." This is altogether careless writing. When we find these personal pronouns crowding too fast upon us, we have often no method left, but to throw the whole sentence into some other form, which may avoid those frequent references to persons who have before been mentioned.

To have the relation of every word and member of a sentence marked, in the most proper and distinct manner, not only gives clearness to it, but makes the mind pass smoothly and agreeably along all the parts of it.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE UNITY OF A SENTENCE.

See Vol. II. p. 322.

THE SECOND requisite of a perfect sentence, is its *Unity*.

In every composition, there is always some connecting principle among the parts. Some one object must reign and be predominant. But most of all, in a single sentence, is required the strictest unity. For the very nature of a sentence implies that one proposition is expressed. It may consist of parts, indeed, but these parts must be so closely bound together, as to make the impression upon the mind, of one object, not of many. To preserve this unity of a sentence, the following rules must be observed.

In the *first* place, *During the course of the sentence, the scene should be changed as little as possible.* We should not be hurried by sudden transitions from person to person, nor from subject to subject. There is commonly, in every sentence, some person or thing which is the governing word. This should be continued so, if possible, from the beginning to the end of it.

The following sentence varies from this rule: "After we came to anchor, they put me on shore, where I was welcomed by all my friends, who received me with the greatest kindness." In this sentence, though the objects contained in it have a sufficient connexion with each other, yet, by this manner of representing them, by shifting so often both the place and the person, *we* and *they*, and *I* and *who*, they appear in so disunited a view, that the sense of connexion is much impaired. The

sentence is restored to its proper unity, by turning it after the following manner. "Having come to an anchor, I was put on shore, where I was welcomed by all my friends, and received with the greatest kindness."

Here follows another instance of departure from the rule. "The sultan being dangerously wounded, they carried him to his tent; and, upon hearing of the defeat of his troops, they put him into a litter, which transported him to a place of safety, at the distance of about fifteen leagues." Better thus: "The sultan being dangerously wounded, was carried to his tent; and, on hearing of the defeat of his troops, was put into a litter, and transported to a place of safety, about fifteen leagues distant."

A *second* rule under the head of unity, is, *Never to crowd into one sentence, things which have so little connexion, that they could bear to be divided into two or three sentences.*

The violation of this rule tends so much to perplex and obscure, that it is safer to err by too many short sentences, than by one that is overloaded and embarrassed. Examples abound in authors. "Archbishop Tillotson," says an author, "died in this year. He was exceedingly beloved by king William and queen Mary, who nominated Dr. Tennison, bishop of Lincoln, to succeed him." Who would expect the latter part of this sentence to follow in consequence of the former? "He was exceedingly beloved by both king and queen," is the proposition of the sentence. We look for some proof of this, or at least something related to it to follow; when we are on a sudden carried off to a new proposition.

The following sentence is still worse. The author, speaking of the Greeks under Alexander, says: "Their march was through an uncultivated country, whose savage inhabitants fared hardly, having no other riches than a

breed of lean sheep, whose flesh was rank and unsavoury, by reason of their continual feeding upon sea-fish." Here the scene is changed upon us again and again. The march of the Greeks, the description of the inhabitants through whose country they travelled, the account of their sheep, and the cause of their sheep being ill tasted food, form a jumble of objects, slightly related to each other, which the reader cannot, without much difficulty, comprehend under one view.

These examples have been taken from sentences of no great length, yet very crowded. Writers who deal in long sentences, are very apt to be faulty in this article. Take, for an instance, the following from Temple. "The usual acceptation takes profit and pleasure for two different things, and not only calls the followers or votaries of them, by the several names of busy and idle men; but distinguishes the faculties of the mind, that are conversant about them; calling the operations of the first, *Wisdom;* and of the other, *Wit;* which is a Saxon word, used to express what the Spaniards and Italians call *Ingenio*, and the French *Esprit*, both from the Latin; though I think wit more particularly signifies that of poetry, as may occur in remarks on the Runic language." When the reader arrives at the end of this perplexed sentence, he is surprised to find himself at so great a distance from the object with which he set out.

It is a frequent and capital error, in the writings even of some distinguished authors, to introduce two or more leading thoughts or agents, which have no natural relation to, or dependence on one another, which cannot concur in pointing towards any one object, and which must therefore destroy the unity of the sentence. Shaftsbury has the following sentence. "As much as the fertile mould is fitted to the tree; as much as the strong and upright trunk of the oak or elm, is fitted to the twining branches of the

vine or ivy; so much are the very leaves, the seeds and fruits of these trees, fitted to the various animals: these, again, to one another, and to the elements where they live, and to which they are as appendices, in a manner, fitted and joined; as either by wings for the air, fins for the water, feet for the earth, and by other correspondent inward parts, of more curious frame and texture." This long and complicated period presents two agents: trees lead the first member; animals, the second and the third. The sentence should, therefore, it seems, be divided into two, or perhaps, into three sentences, with the proper agents prefixed. In this view, the first member may remain as it is; but the second and third members will assume the following appearance. "Animals, again, are fitted to one another, and to the elements where they live, and to which they are as appendices. They are adapted by wings for the air, fins for the water, feet for the earth, and by other correspondent inward parts, of more curious frame and texture."

Sir William Temple, speaking of the worhsip of the Saxons, says; "This religious worship the Saxons introduced with them, and continued long in England, till they subdued the Britons, reduced it under their heptarchy, persecuted the British Christians, and drove them with their religion into Wales; where they continued under their primitive priests and bishops, who, with their monks, were all under the superintendence of one arch-priest or bishop of Carleon, the bound of the British principality." This clumsy period, like the preceding one, contains two agents: it begins with the Saxons, and passes from them to the British Christians; thus diminishing the perspicuity, and destroying the unity. It should have formed two sentences.

Long, involved, and intricate sentences, are great blemishes in composition. In writers of considerable correctness, we find a period sometimes running out so far, and

comprehending so many particulars, as to be more properly a discourse than a sentence. An author, speaking of the progress of our language after the time of Cromwell, runs on in this manner: "To this succeeded that licentiousness which entered with the restoration, and, from infecting our religion and morals, fell to corrupt our language; which last was not like to be much improved by those who at that time made up the court of king Charles the Second; either such as had followed him in his banishment, or who had been altogether conversant in the dialect of these times, or young men who had been educated in the same country: so that the court, which used to be the standard of correctness and propriety of speech, was then, and I think has ever since continued, the worst school in England for that accomplishment; and so will remain, till better care be taken in the education of our nobility, that they may set out into the world with some foundation of literature, in order to qualify them for patterns of politeness."

The author, in place of a sentence, has here given a loose dissertation upon several subjects. How many different facts, reasonings, and observations, are here presented to the mind at once! and yet so linked together by the author, that they all make parts of a sentence, which admits of no greater division in pointing, than a colon between any of its members.

It may be of use here to give a specimen of a long sentence, broken down into several periods; by which we shall more clearly perceive the disadvantages of long sentences, and how easily they may be amended. Here follows the sentence in its original form: "Though, in yesterday's paper, we showed how every thing that is great, new, or beautiful, is apt to affect the imagination with pleasure, we must own, that it is impossible for us to assign the necessary cause of this pleasure, because we know neither the nature of an idea, nor the substance of a human

soul: and therefore, for want of such a light, all that we can do, in speculations of this kind, is, to reflect on those operations of the soul that are most agreeable; and to range, under their proper heads, what is pleasing or displeasing to the mind, without being able to trace out the several necessary and efficient causes, from whence the pleasure or displeasure arises."

The following amendment, besides breaking down the period into several sentences, exhibits some other useful alterations: "In yesterday's paper, we showed that every thing which is great, new, or beautiful, is apt to affect the imagination with pleasure. We must own, that it is impossible for us to assign the efficient cause of this pleasure, because we know not the nature either of an idea, or of the human soul. All that we can do, therefore, in speculations of this kind, is to reflect on the operations of the soul which are most agreeable, and to range under proper heads what is pleasing or displeasing to the mind."

A *third* rule for preserving the unity of sentences, is, *to keep clear of all unnecessary parentheses.*

On some occasions, when the sense is not too long suspended by them, and when they are introduced in a proper place, they may add both to the vivacity, and to the energy, of the sentence. But for the most part their effect is extremely bad. They are wheels within wheels; sentences in the midst of sentences; the perplexed method of disposing of some thought, which a writer wants judgment to introduce in its proper place.

The parenthesis, in this sentence, is striking and proper;

"And was the ransom paid? It was; and paid
"(What can exalt the bounty more?) for thee."

But in the following sentence, we become sensible of an impropriety in the use of it. "If your hearts secretly re-

proach you, for the wrong choice you have made, (as there is time for repentance and retreat; and a return to wisdom is always honourable,) bethink yourselves that the evil is not irreparable." It would be much better to express, in a separate sentence, the thoughts contained in this parenthesis; thus: "If your hearts secretly reproach you for the wrong choice you have made, bethink yourselves that the evil is not irreparable. Still there is time for repentance and retreat; and a return to wisdom is always honourable."

CHAPTER III.

OF THE STRENGTH OF A SENTENCE.

See Vol. II. p. 226.

THE THIRD requisite of a perfect sentence, is, *Strength.*

By this is meant such a disposition and management of the several words and members, as shall bring out the sense to the best advantage, and give every word, and every member, its due weight and force.

A sentence may be clear, it may also be compact in all its parts, or have the requisite unity, and yet, by some circumstance in the structure, it may fail in that strength of impression, which a better management would have produced.

The *first* rule for promoting the strength of a sentence, is, *to prune it of all redundant words and members.*

It is a general maxim, that any words which do not add some importance to the meaning of a sentence, always injure it. Care should therefore be exercised, with respect to synonymous words, expletives, circumlocutions, tautologies, and the expression of unnecessary circumstances. The attention becomes remiss, when words are multiplied without a correspondent multiplication of ideas. "Content with deserving a triumph, he refused the honour of it;" is better language than to say, "Being content with deserving it," &c.

"In the Attic commonwealth," says an author, "it was the privilege and birthright of every citizen and poet, to rail aloud and in public." Better simply thus: "In the Attic commonwealth, it was the privilege of every citizen to rail in public."

Another expresses himself thus: "They returned back again to the same city from whence they came forth;"

instead of, "They returned to the city whence they came." The five words, *back*, *again*, *same*, *from*, and *forth*, are mere expletives, that have neither use nor beauty, and are therefore to be regarded as encumbrances.

The word *but* is often improperly used with *that:* as, "There can be no doubt *but that* he seriously means what he says." It is not only useless, but cumbersome: "There can be no doubt *that* he seriously means what he says." By transposing the parts of the sentence, we shall immediately perceive the propriety of omitting this word: "That he seriously means what he says, there can be no doubt."

Adverbs promote energy of expression. But this happens only when they promote brevity too, and are sparingly used, and chosen with judgment. A superabundance of them, or of adjectives, makes a style unweildy and tawdry. For it is from its nouns, rather than from its attributives, that language derives strength: even as a building derives stability, rather from the walls and rafters, than from the plastering, wainscotting, and painting. Young writers, however, are apt to think otherwise; and, with a view to invigorate their expression, qualify every verb with an adverb, and every noun with an epithet. By this means, their compositions resemble a house, whose walls are supported by posts and buttresses; which not only make it unseemly to the eye, and inconvenient by taking up too much room, but also justify a suspicion of weakness in the work, and unskilfulness in the architect. Such a period as the following will explain our meaning.

"I am honestly, seriously, and unalterably of opinion, that nothing can possibly be more incurably and emphatically destructive, or more decisively fatal, to a kingdom, than the introduction of thoughtless dissipation, and the pomp of lazy luxury." Would not the full import of this

noisy sentence be better expressed thus: "I am of opinion, that nothing is more ruinous to a kingdom, than luxury and dissipation."

Some writers use much circumlocution in expressing their ideas. A considerable one, for so very simple a thing as a man's wounding himself, says, "To mangle, or wound, his outward form and constitution, his natural limbs or body."

But, on some occasions, circumlocution has a peculiar force; as in the following sentence: "Shall not *the Judge of all the earth* do right?"

In the sentences which follow, the ill effects of tautology appear.

"So it is, that I must be *forced* to get home, partly by stealth, and partly by *force*."

"Never did Atticus succeed better in gaining the *universal* love and esteem of *all* men."

The subsequent sentence contains several unnecessary circumstances. "On receiving this information, he arose, went out, saddled his horse, mounted him, and rode to town." All is implied in saying, "On receiving this information, he rode to town."

This manner, however, in a certain degree, is so strongly characteristic of the simple style of remote ages, that, in books of the highest antiquity, particularly the Bible, it is not at all ungraceful. Of this kind are the following scriptural phrases. "He lifted up his voice, and wept." "He opened his mouth and said." It is true, that, in strictness, they are not necessary to the narration, but they are of some importance to the composition, as bearing the venerable signature of ancient simplicity. It may, on this occasion, be further observed, that the language of the present translation of the Bible, ought not to be viewed in an exceptionable light, though some parts of it may appear to be obsolete. From universal admission, this language has become so familiar

and intelligible, that in all transcripts and allusions, except where the sense is evidently injured, it ought to be carefully preserved. And it may also be justly remarked, that, on religious subjects, a frequent recurrence of scripture-language is attended with peculiar force and propriety.

Though it promotes the strength of a sentence, to contract a round about method of expression, and to lop off excrescences, yet we should avoid the extreme of pruning too closely: some leaves should be left to shelter and surround the fruit. Even synonymous expressions may, on some occasions, be used with propriety. One is, when an obscurer term, which we cannot well avoid employing, needs to be explained by one that is clearer. The other is, when the language of the emotions is exhibited. Emotion naturally dwells on its object: and when the reader also feels interested, repetition and synonomy have frequently an agreeable effect.

The following passage, taken from Addison, who delighted in a full and flowing style, will, by most readers, be deemed not very exceptionable. "But there is nothing that makes its way more directly to the soul, than beauty; which immediately diffuses a secret satisfaction and complacency through the imagination, and gives a finishing to any thing that is great or uncommon. The very first discovery of it strikes the mind with inward joy, and spreads a cheerfulness and delight through all its faculties." Some degree of verbosity may, however, be discovered in these sentences, as phrases are repeated which seem little more than the echo of one another; such as—*diffusing satisfaction and complacency through the imagination—striking the mind with inward joy—spreading cheerfulness and delight through all its faculties.* But, perhaps, some redundancy is more allowable on such lively subjects, than it would be on other occasions.

After removing superfluities, the *second* rule for promoting the strength of a sentence, is, *to attend particularly to the use of copulatives, relatives, and all the particles employed for transition and connexion.*

These little words *but, and, or, which, whose, where, then, therefore, because,* &c. are frequently the most important words of any; they are the joints or hinges upon which all sentences turn; and, of course, much of their strength must depend upon such particles. The varieties in using them are, indeed, so many, that no particular system of rules respecting them can be given. Some observations, tending to illustrate the rule, may, however, be mentioned.

What is called splitting particles, or separating a preposition from the noun which it governs, is to be avoided. As if I should say, "Though virtue borrows no assistance from, yet it may often be accompanied by, the advantages of fortune." Here we are put to a stand in thought, being obliged to rest a little on the preposition by itself, which, at the same time, carries no significancy, till it is joined to its proper substantive.

Some writers needlessly multiply demonstrative and relative particles, by the frequent use of such phraseology as this: "There is nothing which disgusts us sooner than the empty pomp of language." In introducing a subject, or laying down a proposition, to which we demand particular attention, this sort of style is very proper; but, on common occasions, it is better to express ourselves more simply and briefly: "Nothing disgusts us sooner than the empty pomp of language."

Other writers make a practice of omitting the relative, where they think the meaning can be understood without it: as, "The man I love;" "The dominions we possessed, and the conquests we made." But though this elliptical style is intelligible, and is allowable in conversation and epistolary writing, yet in all writings of a serious and

dignified kind, it ought to be avoided. There, the relative should always be inserted in its proper place, and the construction filled up. "The man whom I love." "The dominions which we possessed, and the conquests which we made."

With regard to the copulative particle *and*, which occurs so frequently in all kinds of composition, several observations are to be made. First, it is evident, that the unnecessary repetition of it enfeebles style. The following sentence from Sir William Temple, will serve for an instance. He is speaking of the refinement of the French language: "The academy, set up by Cardinal Richelieu, to amuse the wits of that age *and* country, *and* divert them from raking into his politics *and* ministry, brought this into vogue; *and* the French wits have, for this last age, been wholly turned to the refinement of their style *and* language; *and*, indeed, with such success, that it can hardly be equalled, *and* runs equally through their verse *and* their prose." Here are no fewer than eight *ands* in one sentence. Some writers often make their sentences drag in this manner, by a careless multiplication of copulatives.

But, in the next place, it is worthy of observation, that though the natural use of the conjunction *and*, is to join objects together, yet, in fact, by dropping the conjunction, we often mark a closer connexion, a quicker succession of objects, than when it is inserted between them. "I came, I saw, I conquered," expresses, with more force, the rapidity and quick succession of conquest, than if connecting particles had been used.

On the other hand, when we seek to prevent a quick transition from one object to another, when we are making some enumeration, in which we wish that the objects should appear as distinct from each other as possible, and that the mind should rest, for a moment, on each object by itself, copulatives may be multiplied with peculiar ad-

vantage. As when an author says, "Such a man might fall a victim to power; but truth, and reason, and liberty, would fall with him." Observe, in the following enumeration made by the Apostle Paul, what additional weight and distinctness are given to each particular, by the repetition of a conjunction: "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God."

The words designed to mark the transition from one sentence to another, and the connexion between sentences, are sometimes very incorrect, and perform their office in an imperfect and obscure manner. The following is an example of this kind of inaccuracy. "By greatness, I do not mean the bulk of any single object only, but the largeness of a whole view. *Such* are the prospects of an open champaign country, a vast uncultivated desert," &c. The word *such* signifies of that nature or quality, which necessarily pre-supposes some adjective or word descriptive of a quality going before, to which it refers. But, in the foregoing sentence, there is no such adjective. The author had spoken of *greatness* in the abstract only; and, therefore, *such* has no distinct antecedent to which we can refer it. The sentence would have been introduced with more propriety, by saying, *To this class belong*, or, *Under this head are ranged*, the prospects, &c.

As connective particles are the hinges, tacks, and pins, by which the words in the same clause, the clauses in the same member, the members in the same sentence, and even the sentences in the same discourse, are united together, and their relations suggested, so they should not be either too frequently repeated, awkwardly exposed to view, or made up of polysyllables, when shorter words would as well convey our meaning. *Notwithstanding that, insomuch that, forasmuch as, furthermore*, &c. are

tedious words, which tend to overload and perplex a sentence.

We shall conclude this head with two remarks on the subject of inserting or omitting the conjunctions. The first is, that the illative conjunctions, the causal, and the disjunctive, when they suit the sense, can more rarely be dispensed with than the copulative. The second is, that the omission of copulatives always succeeds best, when the connexion of the thoughts is either very close, or very distant. It is mostly in the intermediate cases that the conjunction is deemed necessary. When the connexion in thought is very distant, the copulative appears absurd; and when very close, superfluous.

The *third* rule for promoting the strength of a sentence, is, *to dispose of the capital word, or words, so that they may make the greatest impression.*

That there are, in every sentence, such capital words, on which the meaning principally rests, every one must see; and that these words should possess a conspicuous and distinguished place, is equally plain. For the most part, with us, the important words are placed in the beginning of the sentence. So in the following passages: "Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have, give I unto thee," &c. "Your fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live for ever?"

Sometimes, however, when we intend to give weight to a sentence, it is of advantage to suspend the meaning for a little, and then bring it out full at the close. "Thus," says an author, "on whatever side we contemplate this ancient writer, what principally strikes us, is his wonderful invention."

To accomplish this end, the placing of capital words in a conspicuous part of the sentence, the natural order of our language must sometimes be inverted. According to this natural order, the nominative has the first place,

the verb the second, and the objective, if it be an active verb that is employed, has the third. Circumstances follow the nominative, the verb, or the objective, as they happen to belong to any of them. "Diana of the Ephesians is great," is the natural order of the sentence. But its strength is increased by inversion, thus: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." "I profess, in the sincerity of my heart," &c. is the natural order of a circumstance. Inverted thus: "In the sincerity of my heart, I profess," &c.

Some authors greatly invert the natural order of sentences; others write mostly in a natural style. Each method has its advantages. The inverted possesses strength, dignity, and variety: the other, more nature, ease, and simplicity. We shall give an instance of each method, taken from writers of considerable eminence. The first is of the inverted order. The author is speaking of the misery of vice. "This, as to the complete immoral state, is, what of their own accord, men readily remark. Where there is this absolute degeneracy, this total apostacy from all candour, truth, or equity, there are few who do not see and acknowledge the misery which is consequent. Seldom is the case misconstrued, when at worst. The misfortune is, that we look not on this depravity, nor consider how it stands in less degrees. As if, to be absolutely immoral, were, indeed, the greatest misery; but to be so in a little degree, should be no misery or harm at all. Which, to allow, is just as reasonable as to own, that it is the greatest ill of a body, to be in the utmost manner maimed or distorted; but that to lose the use only of one limb, or to be impaired in some single organ or member, is no ill worthy the least notice." Here is no violence done to the language, though there are many inversions.

The following is an example of natural construction: "Our sight is the most perfect, and the most delightful, of

all our senses. It fills the mind with the largest variety of ideas, converses with its objects at the greatest distance, and continues the longest in action, without being tired, or satiated with its proper enjoyments. The sense of feeling can, indeed, give us a notion of extension, shape, and all other ideas that enter at the eye, except colours; but, at the same time, it is very much straitened and confined in its operations," &c.

But whether we use inversion or not, and in whatever part of the sentence we dispose of the capital words, it is always a point of consequence, that these capital words should stand clear and disentangled from any other words that would clog them. Thus, when there are any circumstances of time, place, or other limitations, which the principal object of our sentence requires to have connected with it, we must take care to dispose of them, so as not to cloud that principal object, nor to bury it under a load of circumstances. This will be made clearer by an example. "If, whilst they profess only to please, they secretly advise, and give instruction, they may now perhaps, as well as formerly, be esteemed, with justice, the best and most honourable among authors." This is a well constructed sentence. It contains a great many circumstances and adverbs necessary to qualify the meaning; *only, secretly, as well, perhaps, now, with justice, formerly;* yet these are placed so properly, as neither to embarrass, nor weaken the sentence; while that which is the capital object in it, viz. "being justly esteemed the best and most honourable among authors," comes out, in the conclusion, clear and detached, and possesses its proper place. See, now, what would have been the effect of a different arrangement: "If, whilst they profess to please only, they advise and give instruction secretly, they may be esteemed the best and most honourable among authors, with justice, perhaps, now as well as formerly." Here we have precisely the same words, and the same sense; but by means of the

circumstances being so intermingled as to clog the capital words, the whole becomes feeble and perplexed.

The *fourth* rule for promoting the strength of sentences, is, *that a weaker assertion or proposition should never come after a stronger one; and that, when our sentence consists of two members, the longer should, generally, be the concluding one.*

Thus, to say, "When our passions have forsaken us, we flatter ourselves with the belief that we have forsaken them," is both more easy and more clear, than to begin with the longer part of the proposition: "We flatter ourselves with the belief that we have forsaken our passions, when they have forsaken us."

In general, it is agreeable to find a sentence rising upon us, and growing in its importance, to the very last word, when this construction can be managed without affectation. "If we rise yet higher," says Addison, "and consider the fixed stars as so many oceans of flame, that are each of them attended with a different set of planets; and still discover new firmaments and new lights, that are sunk farther in those unfathomable depths of ether; we are lost in such a labyrinth of suns and worlds, and confounded with the magnificence and immensity of nature."

The *fifth* rule for the strength of sentences is, *to avoid concluding them with an adverb, a preposition, or any inconsiderable word.*

Agreeably to this rule, we should not conclude with any of the particles, *of, to, from, with, by.* For instance, it is a great deal better to say, "Avarice is a crime of which wise men are often guilty," than to say, "Avarice is a crime which wise men are often guilty of." This is a phraseology which all correct writers shun; and with reason. For as the mind cannot help resting a little, on the import of the word which closes the sentence, it must be disagreeable

to be left pausing on a word, which does not, by itself, produce any idea.

For the same reason, verbs which are used in a compound sense, with some of those prepositions, are, though not so bad, yet still not proper conclusions of a period: such as, *bring about*, *lay hold of*, *come over to*, *clear up*, and many other of this kind; instead of which, if we can employ a simple verb, it always terminates the sentence with more strength. Even the pronoun *it*, should, if possible, be avoided in the conclusion: especially when it is joined with some of the prepositions; as, *with it*, *in it*, *to it*. We shall be sensible of this in the following sentence. "There is not, in my opinion, a more pleasing and triumphant consideration in religion, than this, of the perpetual progress which the soul makes towards the perfection of its nature, without ever arriving at a period *in it*." How much more agreeable the sentence, if it had been so constructed as to close with the word *period!*

Besides particles and pronouns, any phrase, which expresses a circumstance only, always appears badly in the rear of a sentence. We may judge of this by the following passage: "Let me therefore conclude by repeating, that division has caused all the mischief we lament; that union alone can retrieve it; and that a great advance towards this union, was the coalition of parties, so happily begun, so successfully carried on, and of late so unaccountably neglected; to say no worse." This last phrase, "to say no worse," occasions a falling off at the end. The proper disposition of such circumstances in a sentence, requires attention, in order to adjust them so as shall consist equally with the perspicuity and the strength of the period. Though necessary parts, they are, however, like irregular stones in a building, which try the skill of an artist, where to place them with the least offence. But it must be remembered, that the close is

always an unsuitable place for them.—Notwithstanding what has been said against concluding a period with an adverb, &c. this must not be understood to refer to such words, when the stress and significancy of the sentence rest chiefly upon them. In this case, they are not to be considered as circumstances, but as the principal objects: as in the following sentence. "In their prosperity, my friends shall never hear of me, in their adversity, always." Here, "*never*," and "*always*," being emphatical words, were to be so placed as to make a strong impression.

The *sixth* rule relating to the strength of a sentence, is, *that, in the members of a sentence, where two things are* compared, *or* contrasted, *with one another; where either a resemblance or an opposition is intended to be expressed; some resemblance, in the language and construction, should be preserved. For when the things themselves correspond to each other, we naturally expect to find a similar correspondence in the words.*

Thus, when it is said, "The wise man is happy, when he gains his own approbation; the fool, when he recommends himself to the applause of those about him;" the opposition would have been more regular, if it had been expressed thus: "The wise man is happy, when he gains his own approbation; the fool, when he gains that of others."

"A friend exaggerates a man's virtues: an enemy inflames his crimes." Better thus: "A friend exaggerates a man's virtues: an enemy, his crimes."

The following passage from Pope's Preface to his Homer, fully exemplifies the rule just given: "Homer was the greater genius; Virgil, the better artist: in the one, we most admire the man; in the other, the work. Homer hurries us with a commanding impetuosity; Virgil leads us with an attractive majesty. Homer scatters with

a generous profusion; Virgil bestows with a careful magnificence. Homer, like the Nile, pours out his riches with a sudden overflow; Virgil, like a river in its banks, with a constant stream."—Periods thus constructed, when introduced with propriety, and not returning too often, have a sensible beauty. But we must beware of carrying our attention to this beauty too far. It ought only to be occasionally studied, when comparison or opposition of objects naturally leads to it. If such a construction as this be aimed at, in all our sentences, it leads to a disagreeable uniformity; produces a regularly returning clink in the period, which tires the ear; and plainly discovers affectation.

The *seventh* rule for promoting the strength and effect of sentences, is, *to attend to the sound, the harmony and easy flow, of the words and members.*

Sound is a quality much inferior to sense; yet such as must not be disregarded. For, as long as sounds are the vehicle or conveyance for our ideas, there will be a very considerable connexion between the idea which is conveyed, and the nature of the sound which conveys it.—Pleasing ideas, and forcible reasoning, can hardly be transmitted to the mind, by means of harsh and disagreeable sounds. The mind revolts at such sounds, and the impression of the sentiment must consequently be weakened. The observations which we have to make on this subject, respect the choice of words; their arrangement; the order and disposition of the members; the cadence or close of sentences; and the sound of words adapted to their signification.

We begin with the choice of words. It is evident, that words are most agreeable to the ear, when they are composed of smooth and liquid sounds, in which there is a proper intermixture of vowels and consonants; without too many harsh consonants rubbing against each other;

or too many open vowels in succession, to cause a hiatus, or disagreeable aperture of the mouth.

It may always be assumed as a principle, that whatever sounds are difficult in pronunciation, are, in the same proportion, harsh and painful to the ear. Vowels give softness; consonants, strength to the sound of words. The melody of language requires a just proportion of each; and the construction will be hurt, will be rendered either grating or effeminate, by an excess of either. Long words are commonly more agreeable to the ear than monosyllables. They please it by the composition or succession of sounds which they present to it; and accordingly, the most harmonious languages abound most in them. Among words of any length, those are the most melodious, which do not run wholly either upon long or short syllables, but are composed of an intermixture of them: such as, *repent*, *profess*, *powerful*, *velocity*, *celerity*, *independent*, *impetuosity*.

If we would speak forcibly and effectually, we must avoid the use of such words as the following. 1. Such as are composed of words already compounded, the several parts of which are not easily, and therefore not closely united: as, "*Unsuccessfulness*, *wrongheadedness*, *tenderheartedness*." 2. Such as have the syllables which immediately follow the accented syllable, crowded with consonants that do not easily coalesce: as, "*Questionless*, *chroniclers*, *conventiclers*." 3. Such as have too many syllables following the accented syllable: as, "*Primarily*, *cursorily*, *summarily*, *peremptoriness*." 4. Such as have a short or unaccented syllable repeated, or followed by another short or unaccented syllable very much resembling: as, "*Holily*, *sillily*, *lowlily*, *farriery*." A little harshness, by the collision of consonants, which nevertheless our organs find no difficulty in articulating, and which do not suggest to the hearer the disagreeable idea either of precipitation or of stammering, is by no means a

sufficient reason for suppressing a useful term. The words *hedg'd, fledg'd, wedg'd, drudg'd, grudg'd, adjudg'd,* which some have thought very offensive, are not exposed to the objections, which lie against the words above mentioned. We should not do well to introduce such hard and strong sounds too frequently; but when they are used sparingly and properly, they have even a good effect. They contribute to that variety in sound which is advantageous to language.

The next head, respecting the harmony which results from a proper arrangement of words, is a point of greater nicety. For, let the words themselves be ever so well chosen, and well sounding, yet, if they be ill disposed, the melody of the sentence is utterly lost, or greatly impaired. That this is the case, the learners will perceive by the following examples. "Pleasures simple and moderate always are the best:" it would be better to say, "Simple and moderate pleasures are always the best." "Office or rank may be the recompense of intrigue, versatility, or flattery;" better thus, "Rank or office may be the recompense of flattery, versatility, or intrigue." "A great recommendation of the guidance offered by integrity to us, is, that it is by all men easily understood:" better in this form; "It is a great recommendation of the guidance offered to us by integrity, that it is easily understood by all men."—In the following examples, the words are neither selected nor arranged, so as to produce the most agreeable effect. "If we make the best of our life, it is but as a pilgrimage, with dangers surrounding it:" better thus, "Our life, at the best, is a pilgrimage, and dangers surround it." "We see that we are encumbered with difficulties, which we cannot prevent:" better, "We perceive ourselves involved in difficulties that cannot be avoided." "It is plain to any one who views the subject, even slightly, that there is nothing here that is without allay and pure:" improved by this form;

"It is evident to the slightest inspection, that nothing here is unallayed and pure."

We may take, for an instance of a sentence remarkably harmonious, the following from Milton's Treatise on Education: "We shall conduct you to a hill-side, laborious indeed, at the first ascent; but else so smooth, so green, so full of goodly prospects, and melodious sounds on every side, that the harp of Orpheus was not more charming." Every thing in this sentence conspires to promote the harmony. The words are well chosen; full of liquids, and soft sounds; *laborious, smooth, green, goodly, melodious, charming;* and these words so artfully arranged, that, were we to alter the situation of any one of them, we should, presently, be sensible of the melody's suffering. For, let us observe, how finely the members of the period swell one above another. "So smooth, so green,"—"so full of goodly prospects,—and melodious sounds on every side;"—till the ear, prepared by this gradual rise, is conducted to that full close on which it rests with pleasure;—"that the harp of Orpheus was not more charming."

To promote this harmonious arrangement of words, the following general directions will be found of some use: 1st, When the preceding word ends with a vowel, let the subsequent one begin with a consonant; and *vicé versâ*. *A true friend, a cruel enemy,* are smoother and easier to the voice, than *a true union, a cruel destroyer.* But when it is more perspicuous or convenient, for vowels or consonants to end one word and begin the next, it is proper that the vowels be a long and short one; and that the consonants be either a liquid and a mute, or liquids of different sorts; thus, *a lovely offspring; a purer design; a calm retreat;* are more fluent than, *a happy union, a brief petition, a cheap triumph, a putrid distemper, a calm matron, a clean nurse.* From these examples, the student will perceive the importance of accurately understanding

the nature of vowels and consonants, liquids and mutes; with the connexion and influence which subsist amongst them. 2d, In general, a considerable number of long or short words near one another should be avoided. "Disappointment in our expectations is wretchedness;" better thus; "Disappointed hope is misery." "No course of joy can please us long:" better, "No course of enjoyment can delight us long." A succession of words having the same quantity in the accented syllables, whether it be long or short, should also be avoided. "James was needy, feeble, and fearful:" improved thus, "James was timid, feeble, and destitute." "They could not be happy; for he was silly, pettish, and sullen:" better thus; "They could not be happy; for he was simple, peevish, and gloomy." 3d, Words which begin alike, or end alike, must not come together; and the last syllable of the preceding word, should not be the same as the first syllable of the subsequent one. It is not so pleasing and harmonious to say; "This is a convenient contrivance;" "He is an indulgent parent;" "She behaves with uniform formality:" as, "This is a useful contrivance;" "He is a kind parent;" "She behaves with unvaried formality."

We proceed to consider the members of a sentence, with regard to harmony. They should not be too long, nor disproportionate to each other. When they have a regular and proportional division, they are much easier to the voice, are more clearly understood, and better remembered, than when this rule is not attended to: for whatever tires the voice, and offends the ear, is apt to mar the strength of the expression, and to degrade the sense of the author. And this is a sufficient ground for paying attention to the order and proportion of sentences, and the different parts of which they consist. The following passage exhibits sentences in which the different members are proportionally arranged.

Temple, speaking sarcastically of man, says; "But his pride is greater than his ignorance, and what he wants in knowledge he supplies by sufficiency. When he has looked about him as far as he can, he concludes there is no more to be seen; when he is at the end of his line, he is at the bottom of the ocean; when he has shot his best, he is sure none ever did, or ever can, shoot better, or beyond it. His own reason he holds to be the certain measure of truth; and his own knowledge, of what is possible in nature." Here every thing is at once easy to the breath, grateful to the ear, and intelligible to the understanding. See another example of the same kind, in the 17th and 18th verses of the 3d chapter of the prophet Habakkuk. We may remark here, that our present version of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the Psalms, abounds with instances of an harmonious arrangement of the words and members of sentences.

In the following quotation from Tillotson, we shall become sensible of an effect very different from that of the preceding sentences. "This discourse, concerning the easiness of the Divine commands, does all along suppose and acknowledge the difficulties of the first entrance upon a religious course; except only in those persons who have had the happiness to be trained up to religion, by the easy and insensible degrees of a pious and virtuous education." Here there is some degree of harshness and unpleasantness, owing principally to this, that there is properly no more than one pause or rest in the sentence, falling betwixt the two members into which it is divided: each of which is so long as to occasion a considerable stretch of the breath in pronouncing it.

With respect to the cadence or close of a sentence, care should be taken, that it be not abrupt, or unpleasant. The following instances may be sufficient to show the propriety of some attention to this part of the rule. "Virtue, diligence, and industry, joined with good

temper and prudence, are prosperous in general." It would be better thus: "Virtue, diligence, and industry, joined with good temper and prudence, have ever been found the surest road to prosperity." An author speaking of the Trinity, expresses himself thus: "It is a mystery which we firmly believe the truth of, and humbly adore the depth of." How much better would it have been with this transposition! "It is a mystery, the truth of which we firmly believe, and the depth of which we humbly adore."

In order to give a sentence this proper close, the longest member of it, and the amplest words, should be reserved to the conclusion. But in the distribution of the members, and in the cadence of the period, as well as in the sentences themselves, variety must be observed; for the mind soon tires with a frequent repetition of the same tone.

Though attention to the words and members, and the close of sentences, must not be neglected, yet it must also be kept within proper bounds. Sense has its own harmony; and in no instance should perspicuity, precision, or strength of sentiment, be sacrificed to sound. All unmeaning words, introduced merely to round the period, or fill up the melody, are great blemishes in writing. They are childish and trivial ornaments, by which a sentence always loses more in point of weight, than it can gain by such additions to its sound.

We have hitherto considered the nature of agreeable sound, or modulation, in general. It yet remains to treat of a higher beauty of this kind; the sound adapted to the sense. The former was no more than a simple accompaniment, to please the ear; the latter supposes a peculiar expression given to the music. We may remark two degrees of it: first, the current of sound, adapted to the tenor of a discourse; next, a particular resemblance effected between some object, and the sounds that are employed in describing it.

First, the current of sound may be adapted to the tenor of a discourse. Sounds have, in many respects, a correspondence with our ideas; partly natural, partly the effect of artificial associations. Hence it happens, that any one modulation of sound continued, imprints on our style a certain character and expression. Sentences constructed with the Ciceronian fulness and swell, produce the impression of what is important, magnificent, sedate; for this is the natural tone which such a course of sentiment assumes. But they suit no violent passion, no eager reasoning, no familiar address. These always require measures brisker, easier, and often more abrupt. And, therefore, to swell, or to let down the periods, as the subject demands, is a very important rule in composition. No one tenor whatever, supposing it to produce no bad effect from satiety, will answer to all different compositions; nor even to all the parts of the same composition. It were as absurd to write a panegyric, and an invective, in a style of the same cadence, as to set the words of a tender love-song to the air of a warlike march.

It is therefore requisite, that we previously fix in our mind a just idea of the general tone of sound which suits our subject; that is, which the sentiments we are to express, most naturally assume, and in which they most commonly vent themselves; whether round and smooth, or stately and solemn, or brisk and quick, or interrupted and abrupt. This general idea must direct the modulation of our periods.

It may be proper to remark, that our translators of the Bible, have often been happy in suiting their numbers to the subject. Grave, solemn, and majestic subjects, undoubtedly require such an arrangement of words as runs much on long syllables; and, particularly, they require the close to rest upon such. The very first verses of the Bible, are remarkable for this melody: "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth

was without form and void: and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Several other passages, particularly some of the Psalms, afford striking examples of this sort of grave, melodious construction. Any composition that rises considerably above the ordinary tone of prose, such as monumental inscriptions, and panegyrical characters, naturally runs into numbers of this kind.

But, in the next place, besides the general correspondence of the current of sound with the current of thought, there may be a more particular expression attempted, of certain objects, by means of resembling sounds. This can be, sometimes, accomplished in prose composition; but there only in a more faint degree; nor is it so much expected in prose. It is in poetry that it is chiefly looked for; where attention to sound is more demanded, and where the inversions and liberties of poetical style give us a greater command of sound; assisted too by the versification, and that *cantus obscurior*, to which we are naturally led in reading poetry. This requires further illustration: and as the perspicuity, accuracy, and force of poetical composition, form a part of the object of this Appendix, we shall proceed to explain the subject more at large.

The sounds of words may be employed for representing, chiefly, three classes of objects: first, other sounds; secondly, motion; and, thirdly, the emotions and passions of the mind.

FIRST, by a proper choice of words, we may produce a resemblance of other sounds which we mean to describe; such as, the noise of waters, the roaring of winds, or the murmuring of streams. This is the simplest instance of this sort of beauty: for the medium through which we imitate here, is a natural one; sounds represented by other sounds; and between ideas of the same sense, it is easy to form a connexion. No very great art is required in a poet, when he is describing sweet and soft sounds, to

make use of such words as have most liquids and vowels, and glide the most softly; or, when he is describing harsh sounds, to throw together a number of harsh syllables which are of difficult pronunciation. Here the common structure of language assists him; for, it will be found, that, in most languages, the names of many particular sounds are so formed, as to carry some affinity to the sound which they signify: as, with us, the *whistling* of winds, the *buzz* and *hum* of insects, the *hiss* of serpents, the *crash* of falling timber; and many other instances, in which the word has been evidently framed upon the sound it represents. We shall produce a remarkable example of this beauty from Milton, taken from two passages in Paradise Lost, describing the sound made, in the one, by the opening of the gates of Hell; in the other, by the opening of those of Heaven. The contrast between the two, displays, to great advantage, the poet's art. The first is the opening of Hell's gates.

> ....On a sudden, open fly,
> With impetuous recoil, and jarring sound,
> Th' infernal doors; and on their hinges grate
> Harsh thunder..........

Observe, now, the smoothness of the other example.

> ....Heaven open'd wide
> Her ever-during gates, harmonious sound,
> On golden hinges turning............

The following verse contains sounds resembling those of battle in former times.

> ....Arms on armour clashing, bray'd
> Horrible discord; and the madding wheels
> Of brazen fury raged.

In the succeeding verse, we hear the sound of a bow-string immediately after the arrow has been shot.

..............The string let fly
Twang'd short and sharp, like the shrill swallow's cry.

The spring of the pheasant is heard in these lines:

See! from the brake the whirring pheasant springs,
And mounts exulting on triumphant wings.

The following verse gives us the sound of felling trees in a wood.

Loud sounds the axe, redoubling strokes on strokes;
On all sides round the forest hurls her oaks
Headlong. Deep echoing groan the thickets brown;
Then rustling, crackling, crashing, thunder down.

In the succeeding lines, smooth and rough verses correspond to the objects which they describe.

Soft is the strain when zephyr gently blows,
And the smooth stream in smoother numbers flows.
But when loud surges lash the sounding shore,
The hoarse, rough verse should like the torrent roar.

The SECOND class of objects, which the sound of words is often employed to imitate, is Motion; as it is swift or slow, violent or gentle, equable or interrupted, easy or accompanied with effort. Though there can be no natural affinity between sound, of any kind, and motion, yet, in the imagination, there is a strong one; as appears from the connexion between music and dancing. And, therefore, here it is in the poet's power, to give us a lively idea of the kind of motion, he would describe, by means

of sound which corresponds, in our imagination, with that motion. Long syllables naturally give the impression of slow motion. A succession of short syllables presents quick motion to the mind. The following is a beautiful instance of the sound of words corresponding to motion. It is the description of a sudden calm on the seas, in a poem, entitled, *The Fleece.*

> ....With easy course
> The vessels glide; unless their speed be stopp'd
> By dead calms, that oft lie on these smooth seas,
> When ev'ry zephyr sleeps: then the shrouds drop;
> The downy feather, on the cordage hung,
> Moves not; the flat sea shines like yellow gold
> Fus'd in the fire; or like the marble floor
> Of some old temple wide.

In the succeeding lines, we perceive that slow motion is imitated.

> When Ajax strives some rock's vast weight to throw,
> The line too labours, and the words move slow.

In the next example, the verse resembles swift and easy motion.

> Not so when swift Camilla scours the plain,
> Flies o'er th' unbending corn, and skims along the main.

The following verses exemplify laborious and impetuous motion.

> With many a weary step, and many a groan,
> Up the high hill he heaves a huge round stone;
> The huge round stone resulting with a bound,
> Thunders impetuous down, and smokes along the ground.

The next verse is expressive of regular and slow movement.

> First march the heavy mules securely slow :
> O'er hills, o'er dales, o'er crags, o'er rocks, they go.

In the following lines, slow and difficult motion is imitated.

> A needless Alexandrine ends the song,
> That, like a wounded snake, drags its slow length along.

The succeeding lines imitate violent and irregular motion, that of a rock torn from the brow of a mountain.

> Still gath'ring force, it smokes, and urg'd amain,
> Whirls, leaps, and thunders down, impetuous to the plain.

The THIRD set of objects, which the sound of words is capable of representing, consists of the passions and emotions of the mind. Sound may, at first view, appear foreign to these: but that here, also, there is some sort of connexion, is sufficiently proved by the power which music has to awaken, or to assist certain passions; and, according as its strain is varied, to introduce one train of ideas, rather than another. This, indeed, logically speaking, cannot be called a resemblance between the sense and the sound, seeing long or short syllables have no natural resemblance to any thought or passion. But if the arrangement of syllables, by their sound alone, recalls one set of ideas more readily than another, and disposes the mind for entering into that affection which the poet means to raise, such arrangement may, justly enough, be said to resemble the sense, or be similar or correspondent to it. Without much study or reflection, a poet describing pleasure, joy, and agreeable objects, from the feeling of his subject, naturally runs into smooth, liquid, and flowing

numbers. Brisk and lively sensations exact quicker and more animated numbers. Melancholy and gloomy subjects naturally express themselves in slow measures, and long words.

The following verses may justly be said to resemble the pensive strain which they describe.

> In those deep solitudes and awful cells,
> Where heavenly pensive contemplation dwells,
> And ever-musing melancholy reigns.

In the succeeding lines, the sound of the verse is made to imitate reluctance of mind.

> For who to dumb forgetfulness a prey,
> This pleasing, anxious being e'er resign'd;
> Left the warm precincts of the cheerful day,
> Nor cast one longing, ling'ring look behind?

We have now given sufficient openings into this subject: a moderate acquaintance with good writers, will suggest many instances of the same kind. We proceed to explain the nature of Figures of Speech, the proper use of which contributes to the force and accuracy of a sentence.

CHAPTER IV.

OF FIGURES OF SPEECH.

See Vol. II. p. 240.

THE FOURTH requisite of a perfect sentence, is a judicious use of the Figures of Speech.

As figurative language is to be met with in almost every sentence; and, when properly employed, confers beauty and strength on composition; some knowledge of it appears to be indispensable to the scholars, who are learning to form their sentences with perspicuity, accuracy, and force. We shall, therefore, enumerate the principal figures, and give them some explanation.

In general, Figures of Speech imply some departure from simplicity of expression; the idea which we mean to convey is expressed in a particular manner, and with some circumstance added, which is designed to render the impression more strong and vivid. When I say, for instance, "That a good man enjoys comfort in the midst of adversity;" I just express my thoughts in the simplest manner possible: but when I say, "To the upright there ariseth light in darkness;" the same sentiment is expressed in a figurative style; a new circumstance is introduced; "light," is put in the place of "comfort," and "darkness" is used to suggest the idea of "adversity." In the same manner, to say, "It is impossible, by any search we can make, to explore the Divine Nature fully," is to make a simple proposition: but when we say, "Canst thou, by searching, find out the Lord? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is high as heaven, what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know?" this introduces a figure into style; the pro-

position being not only expressed, but with it admiration and astonishment.

But, though figures imply a deviation from what may be reckoned the most simple form of speech, we are not thence to conclude, that they imply any thing uncommon, or unnatural. On many occasions, they are both the most natural, and the most common method of uttering our sentiments. It would be very difficult to compose any discourse, without using them often; nay, there are few sentences of considerable length, in which there does not occur some expression that may be termed a figure. This being the case, we may see the necessity of some attention, in order to understand their nature and use.

At the commencement of language, men would begin with giving names to the different objects which they discerned, or thought of. The stock of words would, then, be very small. As men's ideas multiplied, and their acquaintance with objects increased, their store of names and words would also increase. But to the vast variety of objects and ideas, no language is adequate. No language is so copious, as to have a separate word for every separate idea. Men naturally sought to abridge this labour of multiplying words without end; and, in order to lay less burden on their memories, made one word, which they had already appropriated to a certain idea or object, stand also for some other idea or object, between which and the primary one, they found, or fancied, some relation. The names of sensible objects, were the words most early introduced; and were, by degrees, extended to those mental objects, of which men had more obscure conceptions, and to which they found it more difficult to assign distinct names. They borrowed, therefore, the name of some sensible idea, where their imagination found some affinity. Thus, we speak of a *piercing* judgment, and a *clear* head; a *soft* or a *hard* heart; a *rough* or a

smooth behaviour. We say, *inflamed* by anger, *warmed* by love, *swelled* with pride, *melted* into grief; and these are almost the only significant words which we have for such ideas.

The principal advantages of figures of speech, are the two following.

FIRST, They enrich language, and render it more copious. By their means, words and phrases are multiplied, for expressing all sorts of ideas: for describing even the minutest differences; the nicest shades and colours of thought; which no language could possibly do by proper words alone, without assistance from Tropes.

SECONDLY, They frequently give us a much clearer and more striking view of the principal object, than we could have, if it were expressed in simple terms, and divested of its accessory idea. By a well chosen figure, even conviction is assisted, and the impression of a truth upon the mind, made more lively and forcible than it would otherwise be. We perceive this, in the following illustration of Young: "When we dip too deep in pleasure, we always stir a sediment that renders it impure and noxious:" and in this instance: "A heart boiling with violent passions, will always send up infatuating fumes to the head." An image that presents so much congruity between a moral and a sensible idea, serves, like an argument from analogy, to enforce what the author asserts, and to induce belief.

Figures, in general, may be described, to be that language, which is prompted either by the imagination, or by the passions. They have been commonly divided into two great classes; Figures of Words, and Figures of Thought. The former, Figures of Words, are commonly called Tropes, and consist in a word's being employed to signify something, which is different from its original and

primitive meaning; so that if we alter the word, we destroy the Figure: as in the instance before given; "Light ariseth to the upright, in darkness." The other class, termed Figures of Thought, supposes the words to be used in their proper and literal meaning, and the Figure to consist in the turn of the thought; as is the case in exclamations, interrogations, apostrophes, comparisons, &c. The distinction of these ornaments of language, into Tropes and Figures, does not appear to be of much use, nor is it always to be clearly ascertained. Figures of Imagination, and Figures of Passion, might be a more correct and useful distribution of the subject.

Having considered the general nature of figures, we proceed next to particularize such of them as are of the most importance; viz.

1. METAPHOR,	9. HYPERBOLE,
2. ALLEGORY,	10. VISION,
3. COMPARISON,	11. INTERROGATION,
4. METONYMY,	12. EXCLAMATION,
5. SYNECDOCHE,	13. IRONY,
6. PERSONIFICATION,	AND
7. APOSTROPHE,	14. AMPLIFICATION OR
8. ANTITHESIS,	CLIMAX.

A METAPHOR is a figure founded entirely on the resemblance which one object bears to another. Hence, it is much allied to simile or comparison, and is indeed no other than a comparison, expressed in an abridged form. When I say of some great minister, "That he upholds the state, like a pillar which supports the weight of a whole edifice," I fairly make a comparison: but when I say of such a minister, "That he is the pillar of the state," it now becomes a metaphor. In the latter case, the comparison between the minister and a pillar, is made in the

mind; but it is expressed without any of the words that denote comparison.

If we compare human life to a landscape, in which are weeds, gardens, hills, valleys, open fields, plantations, we form a simile: but if, with Pope, we affirm, that human life is actually a scene of all these objects, we form a picturesque and instructive metaphor.

> "Let us (since life can little else supply,
> Than just to look about us, and to die)
> Expatiate free o'er all this scene of man;
> A mighty maze! but not without a plan;
> A wild, where weeds and flow'rs promiscuous shoot;
> A garden tempting with forbidden fruit.
> Together let us beat this ample field,
> Try what the open, what the covert yield;
> The latent tracts, the giddy heights, explore,
> Of all who blindly creep, or sightless soar."

The following are examples of metaphor taken from Scripture: "I will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her." "Thou art my rock and my fortress." "Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path."

The utility and beauty of metaphors may be farther illustrated, by another example taken from a distinguished author; and by contrasting his highly ornamented expressions, with that tame and simple phraseology, in which, perhaps, a writer of inferior genius would have communicated his thoughts. The example is as follows: "Banish all your imaginary, and you will suffer no real wants. The little stream that is left, will suffice to quench the thirst of nature; and that which cannot be quenched by it, is not your thirst, but your distemper." The following are the same sentiments in plain language: "Re-

strict your desires to the satisfaction of the real wants of nature. A small portion of the good things of this world, is sufficient for that purpose: if you desire more, you have not yet learned that moderation which constitutes true happiness." In the latter phraseology, the ideas remain, the understanding is instructed, and wisdom is perhaps instilled; but the ornament is all fled, the imagination is neglected, and the heart is not impressed.

Rules to be observed in the use of metaphors.

1. *Metaphors, as well as other figures, should, on no occasion, be stuck on profusely; and should always be such as accord with the strain of our sentiment.* The latter part of the following passage, from a late historian, is, in this respect, very exceptionable. He is giving an account of the famous act of parliament against irregular marriages in England. "The bill," says he, "underwent a great number of alterations and amendments, which were not effected without violent contest. At length, however, it was floated through both houses on the tide of a great majority, and steered into the safe harbour of royal approbation."

2. Care should be taken that *the resemblance, which is the foundation of the metaphor, be clear and perspicuous, not far-fetched, nor difficult to discover.* The transgression of this rule makes what are called harsh or forced metaphors; which are displeasing, because they puzzle the reader, and instead of illustrating the thought, render it perplexed and intricate.

3. In the third place, we should be careful, in the conduct of metaphors, *never to jumble metaphorical and plain*

language together. An author, addressing himself to the king, says:

> To thee the world its present homage pays;
> The *harvest* early, but mature the *praise*.

It is plain, that, had not the rhyme misled him to the choice of an improper phrase, he would have said,

> The *harvest* early, but mature the *crop*;

and so would have continued the figure which he had begun. Whereas, by dropping it unfinished, and by employing the literal word "praise," when we were expecting something that related to the harvest, the figure is broken, and the two members of the sentence have no suitable correspondence to each other.

In the following example, the metaphorical and the literal meaning, are improperly mixed. Dryden, in his introduction to his translation of Juvenal, says; "Thus I was sailing on a vast ocean, before the use of the loadstone or knowledge of the compass, without other help than the polar star of the ancients, and the rules of the French stage among the moderns." Every reader must perceive the incoherence of the transition from the figurative expression, "the polar star of the ancients," to the literal phraseology, "the rules of the French stage among the moderns;" and the inconsistency of pretending to navigate the ocean, by the laws of the theatre.

The subsequent quotation from Garth, is still more exceptionable.

> But now from gath'ring clouds destruction pours,
> Which ruins with mad rage our halcyon hours;
> Mists from black jealousies the tempest form,
> While late divisions reinforce the storm.

That destruction might be poured from a cloud, in the form of lightning, thunder, or a water-spout, is possible and intelligible; that it might occasion a temporary devastation and general terror, is conceivable and very probable. But what opinion shall we form of its effects and appearance, when, in the next line, it assumes the functions of a fury, and takes up its residence in society, "to ruin with mad rage our halcyon hours?" The storm returns in the third line, and is supposed, not without reason perhaps, to arise from collected mists: but the source of these mists is not a little extraordinary, being derived from "black jealousies," which exist only in the minds of men. A new figure is introduced in the last line; political divisions are supposed to form a reserve, which marches in support of the dominion of the tempest. Such motley composition justly deserves reprehension.

4. We should avoid making two inconsistent metaphors meet on one object. This is what is called *mixed* metaphor, and is indeed one of the greatest misapplications of this figure. One may be "*sheltered* under the patronage of a great man:" but it would be wrong to say, "*sheltered* under the mask of dissimulation;" as a mask conceals, but does not shelter. Addison in his letter from Italy, says:

> I *bridle* in my struggling muse with pain,
> That longs to *launch* into a bolder strain.

The muse, figured as a horse, may be bridled; but when we speak of launching, we make it a ship; and by no force of imagination, can it be supposed both a horse

and a ship at one moment; *bridled*, to hinder it from *launching*.

The same author, elsewhere, says, "There is not a single view of human nature, which is not sufficient to *extinguish* the *seeds* of pride." Observe the incoherence of the things here joined together; making a view *extinguish*, and extinguish *seeds*.

Dean Swift observes, that "Those whose minds are dull and heavy, do not easily penetrate into the folds and intricacies of an affair; and therefore they can only scum off what they find at the top." That the author had a right to represent his affair, whatever it was, either as a bale of cloth, or a fluid, nobody can deny. But the laws of perspicuity and common sense demanded of him, to keep it either the one or the other, because it could not be both at the same time. It was absurd, therefore, after he had penetrated the folds of it, an operation practicable only on the supposition of its being some pliable, solid body, to speak of scumming off what floated on the surface, which could not be performed unless it were a fluid.

As metaphors ought never to be mixed, so they should not be crowded together on the same object; for the mind has difficulty in passing readily through many different views of the same object, presented in quick succession.

The *last* rule concerning metaphors, is, *that they be not too far pursued*. If the resemblance, on which the figure is founded, be long dwelt upon, and carried into all its minute circumstances, we tire the reader, who soon grows disgusted with this stretch of fancy; and we render our discourse

obscure. This is called *straining a metaphor*. Authors of a lively and strong imagination are apt to run into this exuberance of metaphor. When they hit upon a figure that pleases them, they are loth to part with it, and frequently continue it so long, as to become tedious and intricate. We may observe, for instance, how the following metaphor is spun out.

> Thy thoughts are vagabonds; all outward bound,
> 'Midst sands, and rocks, and storms, to cruise for pleasure;
> If gain'd, dear bought; and better miss'd than gain'd.
> Fancy and sense, from an infected shore,
> Thy cargo bring; and pestilence the prize:
> Then such a thirst, insatiable thirst,
> By fond indulgence but inflam'd the more;
> Fancy still cruises, when poor sense is tired.

An Allegory may be regarded as a metaphor continued; since it is the representation of some one thing by another that resembles it, and which is made to stand for it. We may take from the Scriptures a very fine example of an allegory, in the 80th psalm; where the people of Israel are represented under the image of a vine: and the figure is carried throughout with great exactness and beauty. "Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt: thou hast cast out the heathen and planted it. Thou preparedst room before it; and didst cause it to take deep root, and it filled the land. The hills were covered with the shadow of it: and the boughs thereof were like the goodly cedars. She sent out her boughs into the sea, and her branches into the river. Why hast thou broken down her hedges, so that all they which pass by the way do pluck her? The boar out of the wood doth waste it, and the wild beast of the field doth devour it. Return, we beseech thee, O God

of Hosts, look down from heaven, and behold, and visit this vine!" See also Ezekiel, xvii. 22—24.

Allegories often combine both ornament and instruction. No picture can more forcibly impress the imagination, no reasoning can so effectually excite the aversion of the heart, as the allegories of Sin and Death, in Paradise Lost.

...............“ Before the gates there sat,
On either side, a formidable shape.
The one seem'd woman to the waist, and fair,
But ended foul in many a scaly fold
Voluminous and vast, a serpent arm'd
With mortal sting; about her middle round
A cry of hell-hounds, never ceasing, bark'd
With wide Cerberean mouths, full loud, and rung
A hideous peal: yet when they list, would creep,
If ought disturb'd their noise, into her womb,
And kennel there; yet there still bark'd and howl'd
Within, unseen."

...............“ The other shape,
If shape it might be call'd that shape had none,
Or substance might be call'd that shadow seem'd,
For each seem'd either; black it stood as night,
Fierce as ten furies, terrible as hell,
And shook a dreadful dart: what seem'd his head
The likeness of a kingly crown had on."

These figures are strongly marked, and the resemblance of their characters to their effects produced in life, is too obvious to need any comment.

The first and principal requisite in the conduct of an allegory, is, *that the figurative and the literal meaning, be*

not mixed inconsistently together. Indeed, all the rules, that were given for metaphors, may also be applied to allegories, on account of the affinity they bear to each other. The only material difference between them, besides the one being short and the other being prolonged, is, that a metaphor always explains itself by the words that are connected with it, in their proper and natural meaning: as, when I say, "Achilles was a lion;" "An able minister is the pillar of the state;" the "lion" and the "pillar" are sufficiently interpreted by the mention of "Achilles" and the "minister," which I join to them; but an allegory is, or may be, allowed to stand less connected with the literal meaning, the interpretation not being so directly pointed out, but left to our own reflection.

Allegory was a favourite method of delivering instruction in ancient times; for what we call fables or parables, are no other than allegories. By words and actions attributed to beasts or inanimate objects, the dispositions of men were figured; and what we call the moral, is the unfigured sense or meaning of the allegory. An enigma or riddle is also a species of allegory; one thing represented or imaged by another; but purposely wrapped up under so many circumstances, as to be rendered obscure. Where a riddle is not intended, it is always a fault in allegory to be too dark. The meaning should be easily seen, through the figure employed to shadow it. However, the proper mixture of light and shade, in such compositions; the exact adjustment of all the figurative circumstances with the literal sense, so as neither to lay the meaning too bare and open, nor to cover and wrap it up too much; have ever been considered as points of great nicety; and there are few species of composition, in which it is more difficult to write so as to please and

command attention, than in allegories. In some of the visions of the Spectator, we have examples of allegories very happily executed.

A COMPARISON OR SIMILE, is, when the resemblance between two objects is *expressed in form*, and generally pursued more fully than the nature of a metaphor admits: as when it is said; "The actions of princes are like those great rivers, the course of which every one beholds, but their springs have been seen by few." "As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people." "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious ointment, &c. and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion."

The advantage of this figure arises from the illustration which the simile employed gives to the principal object; from the clearer view which it presents; or the more strong impression which it stamps upon the mind. Observe the effect of it in the following instance. The author is explaining the distinction, between the powers of sense and imagination in the human mind. "As wax," says he, "would not be adequate to the purpose of signature, if it had not the power to retain, as well as to receive, the impression, the same holds of the soul with respect to sense and imagination. Sense is its receptive power; imagination, its retentive. Had it sense without imagination, it would not be as wax, but as water; where, though all impressions are instantly made, yet as soon as they are made, they are instantly lost."

In comparisons of this nature, the understanding is concerned much more than the fancy: and therefore the rules to be observed, with respect to them, are, that they be

clear, and that they be useful; that they tend to render our conception of the principal object more distinct; and that they do not lead our view aside, and bewilder it with any false light. We should always remember, that similies are not arguments. However apt they may be, they do no more than explain the writer's sentiments; they do not prove them to be founded on truth.

The preceding examples obviously tend to convey stronger impressions of the principal object, than could have been done without the figurative expressions. Similies are sometimes calculated to augment the pleasure of those impressions, by a splendid assemblage of adjacent and agreeable objects. The following quotation, accordingly, besides presenting a striking view of the points of resemblance, conveys additional gratification, by the beauty of the landscape they concur to form. Homer introduces a most charming night scene, while his main object is only to illustrate the situation of the Grecian camp after a battle.

The troops, exulting, sat in order round,
And beaming fires illumin'd all the ground.
As when the moon, resplendent orb of night,
O'er heaven's pure azure sheds her sacred light;
When not a cloud o'ercasts the solemn scene,
And not a breath disturbs the deep serene;
Around her throne the vivid planets roll,
And stars unnumber'd gild the glowing pole;
O'er the dark trees a yellow verdure spread,
And tip with silver ev'ry mountain's head.
Then shine the vales, the rocks in prospect rise,
A flood of glory bursts from all the skies.

The conscious swains, rejoicing in the night,
Eye the blue vault, and bless the useful light.
So, many flames before proud Ilion blaze,
And lighten glimmering Xanthus with their rays.

Comparisons ought not to be founded on likenesses which are obscure, faint, or remote. For these, in place of assisting, strain the mind to comprehend them, and throw no light upon the subject. It is also to be observed, that a comparison which, in the principal circumstances, carries a sufficiently near resemblance, may become unnatural and obscure, if pushed too far. Nothing is more opposite to the design of this figure, than to hunt after a great number of coincidences in minute points, merely to show how far the writer's ingenuity can stretch the resemblance.

The following simile was intended by Milton to illustrate the anxiety, with which Satan traversed the creation, in order to find out subjects of destruction and revenge.

As when a vulture on Imaus bred,
Whose snowy ridge the roving Tartar bounds,
Dislodging from a region scarce of prey,
To gorge the flesh of lambs or yearling kids,
On hills where flocks are fed, flies to the springs
Of Ganges or Hydaspes Indian streams,
But in his way lights on the barren plains
Of Sericana, where Chineses drive,
With sails and wind, their cany waggons light;
So, on this windy sea of land, the fiend
Walk'd up and down alone, bent on his prey.

The objects contained in this comparison are so little known, even to those who claim the character of being

MAHARAJA SERFOGI'S SA

learned, and they are so totally unknown to the greater part of readers, that it has the appearance of a riddle, or a pompous parade of erudition, rather than of a figure to illustrate something less conspicuous and striking than itself.

A METONOMY is founded on the several relations, of cause and effect, container and contained, sign and thing signified. When we say: "They read Milton," the cause is put instead of the effect; meaning "Milton's works." On the other hand, when it is said, "Gray hairs should be respected," we put the effect for the cause, meaning by "gray hairs," *old age.* "The kettle boils," is a phrase where the name of the container is substituted for that of the thing contained. "To assume the sceptre," is a common expression for entering on royal authority; the sign being put for the thing signified.

When the whole is put for a part, or a part for the whole; a genus for a species, or a species for a genus; in general, when any thing less, or any thing more, is put for the precise object meant; the figure is then called a SYNECDOCHE or COMPREHENSION. It is very common, for instance, to describe a whole object by some remarkable part of it: as when we say: "A fleet of twenty *sail,*" in the place of "*ships*;" when we use the "*head*" for the "*person,*" the "*waves*" for the "*sea.*" In like manner, an attribute may be put for a subject: as, "Youth" for the "young," the "deep" for the "sea;" and sometimes a subject for its attribute.

By this figure, virtues and vices are put for the persons in whom they are found: as in that beautiful passage of Cicero, where he compares the profligate army of Çatiline,

with the forces of the state. "On this side, modesty is engaged; on that, impudence: on this, chastity; on that, lewdness: on this, integrity; on that, deceit: on this, piety; on that, profaneness: on this, constancy; on that, fury: on this, honour; on that, baseness: on this, moderation; on that, unbridled passion: in a word, equity, temperance, fortitude, prudence, and all virtues, engage with injustice, luxury, cowardice, rashness, and all vices."—This example is an instance of *Synecdoche* and *Antithesis* joined together.

PERSONIFICATION OR PROSOPOPOEIA, is that figure by which we attribute life and action to inanimate objects. The use of this figure is very natural and extensive: there is a wonderful proneness in human nature, under emotion, to animate all objects. When we say, "the ground *thirsts* for rain," or, "the earth *smiles* with plenty;" when we speak of "ambition's being *restless*," or, "a disease's being *deceitful*;" such expressions show the facility, with which the mind can accommodate the properties of living creatures to things that are inanimate, or to abstract conceptions of its own forming. The following are striking examples from the Scriptures: "When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Judah from a people of strange language; the sea saw it, and fled; Jordan was driven back! The mountains skipped like rams, and the little hills like lambs. What ailed thee, O thou sea! that thou fleddest? Thou Jordan, that thou wast driven back? Ye mountains, that ye skipped like rams; and ye little hills, like lambs? Tremble, thou earth, at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the God of Jacob."

"The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them: and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."

Milton thus describes the immediate effects of eating the forbidden fruit. Terror produces the figure.

> Earth trembled from her entrails, as again
> In pangs, and nature gave a second groan;
> Sky low'r'd, and, mutt'ring thunder, some sad drops
> Wept, at completing of the mortal sin.

The impatience of Adam to know his origin, is supposed to prompt the personification of all the objects he beheld, in order to procure information.

> .... Thou sun, said I, fair light!
> And thou enlighten'd earth, so fresh and gay!
> Ye hills and dales, ye rivers, woods, and plains,
> And ye that live and move, fair creatures tell,
> Tell, if you saw, how came I thus, how here?

We shall give a remarkably fine example of this figure, from bishop Sherlock. He has beautifully personified natural religion: and we may perceive, in the personification, the spirit and grace which the figure, when well conducted, bestows on discourse. The author is comparing together our Saviour and Mahomet. "Go (says he) to your Natural Religion: lay before her Mahomet, and his disciples, arrayed in armour and blood, riding in triumph over the spoils of thousands who fell by his victorious sword. Show her the cities which he set in flames, the countries which he ravaged and destroyed, and the miserable distress of all the inhabitants of the earth. When she has viewed him in this scene, carry her into his retirement; show her the Prophet's chamber; his concubines and his wives; and let her hear him allege revelation, and a Divine command, to justify his adultery and lust."

"When she is tired with this prospect, then show her the blessed Jesus, humble and meek, doing good to all the sons of men. Let her see him in his most retired privacies; let her follow him to the mount, and hear his devotions and supplications to God. Carry her to his table, to view his poor fare; and hear his heavenly discourse. Let her attend him to the tribunal, and consider the patience with which he endured the scoffs and reproaches of his enemies. Lead her to his cross; let her view him in the agony of death, and hear his last prayer for his persecutors; 'Father forgive them, for they know not what they do.'—When Natural Religion has thus viewed both, ask her, which is the Prophet of God?—But her answer we have already had, when she saw part of this scene, through the eyes of the Centurion, who attended at the cross. By him she spoke, and said, 'Truly this man was the Son of God.'" This is more than elegant; it is truly sublime. The whole passage is animated; and the Figure rises at the conclusion, when Natural Religion, who, before, was only a spectator, is introduced as speaking by the Centurion's voice.

This figure of speech is sometimes very improperly and extravagantly applied. A capital error in personifying objects, is, to deck them with fantastic and trifling circumstances. A practice of this sort dissolves the potent charm, which enchants and deceives the reader; and either leaves him dissatisfied, or excites, perhaps, his risibility. Another error, frequent in descriptive personifications, consists in introducing them, when the subject of discussion is destiute of dignity, and the reader is not prepared to relish them. One can scarcely peruse, with composure, the following use of this figure. It is the language of our elegant poet Thomson, who thus personifies and connects the bodily appetites, and their gratifications.

Then sated Hunger bids his brother Thirst
Produce the mighty bowl:
Nor wanting is the brown October, drawn
Mature and perfect, from his dark retreat
Of thirty years: and now his honest front
Flames in the light refulgent.

It is to be remarked, concerning this figure, and short metaphors and similies, which also have been allowed to be the proper language of high passion, that they are the proper expressions of it, only on those occasions when it is so far moderated as to admit of words. The first and highest transports seem to overwhelm the mind, and are denoted by silence or groans: next succeeds the violent and passionate language, of which these figures constitute a great part. Such agitation, however, cannot long continue; the passions having spent their force, the mind soon subsides into that exhausted and dispirited state, in which all figures are improper.

Apostrophe is a turning off from the regular course of the subject, to address some person or thing: as, "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?"

The following is an instance of personification and apostrophe united: "O thou sword of the Lord! how long will it be ere thou be quiet? put thyself up into thy scabbard, rest and be still! How can it be quiet, seeing the Lord hath given it a charge against Askelon, and against the sea-shore? there hath he appointed it." See also an extraordinary example of these figures, in the 14th chapter of Isaiah, from the 4th to the 19th verse, where the prophet describes the fall of the Assyrian empire.

A principal error, in the use of the Apostrophe, is, to deck the object addressed with affected ornaments; by which authors relinquish the expression of passion, and substitute for it the language of fancy.

Another frequent error is, to extend this figure to too great length. The language of violent passion is always concise, and often abrupt. It passes suddenly from one object to another. It often glances at a thought, starts from it, and leaves it unfinished. The succession of ideas is irregular, and connected by distant and uncommon relations. On all these accounts, nothing is more unnatural than long speeches, uttered by persons under the influence of strong passions. Yet this error occurs in several poets of distinguished reputation.

The next figure in order, is ANTITHESIS. Comparison is founded on the resemblance; antithesis, on the contrast or opposition of two objects. Contrast has always the effect to make each of the contrasted objects appear in the stronger light. White, for instance, never appears so bright as when it is opposed to black; and when both are viewed together. An author, in his defence of a friend against the charge of murder, expresses himself thus: "Can you believe that the person whom he scrupled to slay, when he might have done so with full justice, in a convenient place, at a proper time, with secure impunity; he made no scruple to murder against justice, in an unfavourable place, at an unseasonable time, and at the risk of capital condemnation."

The following examples further illustrate this figure.

> Tho' deep, yet clear; tho' gentle, yet not dull;
> Strong without rage; without o'erflowing, full.

"If you wish to enrich a person, study not to increase his stores, but to diminish his desires."

"If you regulate your desires according to the standard of nature, you will never be poor; if according to the standard of opinion, you will never be rich."

A maxim, or moral saying, very properly receives the form of the two last examples; both because it is supposed to be the fruit of meditation, and because it is designed to be engraven on the memory, which recalls it more easily by the help of such contrasted expressions. But where such sentences frequently succeed each other; where this becomes an author's favourite and prevailing manner of expressing himself, his style appears too much studied and laboured; it gives us the impression of an author attending more to his manner of saying things, than to the things themselves.

The following is a beautiful example of Antithesis. "If Cato may be censured, severely indeed, but justly, for abandoning the cause of liberty, which he would not, however, survive; what shall we say of those, who embrace it faintly, pursue it irresolutely, grow tired of it when they have much to hope, and give it up when they have nothing to fear?"—The capital antithesis of this sentence, is instituted between the zeal of Cato for liberty, and the indifference of some others of her patrons. But, besides the leading antithesis, there are two subordinate ones, in the latter member: "Grow tired of it, when they have much to hope; and give it up, when they have nothing to fear."

The eloquent Burke has exhibited a fine instance of this figure, in his eulogium of the philanthropic Howard.

"He has visited all Europe,—not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces, or the stateliness of temples; not

to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art; nor to collect medals, or collate manuscripts:—but to dive into the depths of dungeons; to plunge into the infection of hospitals; to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain; to take the gage and dimensions of misery, depression, and contempt; to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken, and compare and collate the distresses of all men, in all countries."

Antithesis makes the most brilliant appearance in the delineation of characters, particularly in history. The author, in the performance of this delicate part of his task, has an opportunity of displaying his discernment, and knowledge of human nature; and of distinguishing those nice shades by which virtues and vices approach one another. It is by such colours that a character may be strongly painted; and Antithesis is necessary to denote these distinctions. The following character of Atticus, delineated by Pope, is a very lively and forcible example of this figure.

" Should such a man, too fond to rule alone,
Bear, like the Turk, no brother near his throne,
View him with scornful, yet with jealous eyes,
And hate for arts that caused himself to rise;
Blame with faint praise, assent with civil leer,
And, without sneering, teach the rest to sneer;
Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike,
Just hint a fault, and hesitate dislike;
Alike resolv'd to blame, or to commend,
A timorous foe, and a suspicious friend;
Dreading e'en fools, by flatterers besieged,
And so obliging, that he ne'er obliged:
Who would not smile, if such a man there be?
Who would not weep, if Atticus were he?"

No figure, perhaps, has been so anxiously sought, and with so little success, as Antithesis. It is much suited to impose on an unskilful reader; and an author is very apt to employ it, who abounds not with solid and important matter. Many readers are apt to consider the surprise and brilliancy it presents as certain marks of genius; and they are inclined to believe, that they have been amused and instructed, because their admiration has been excited. It is not easy, in an enlightened age, to shine in writing, by solidity and novelty of matter, simplicity and elegance of manner. Much reading, much reflection, much practice, and much careful and laborious criticism, must be employed before this important end can be attained. Authors who possess, perhaps, some genius, but who are defective in correct taste and judgment, seem to wish to take a shorter path to fame: to compensate for the slightness of their matter, they endeavour to dazzle by the liveliness and attractions of their style. But if we may judge from the history of ancient literature, an extravagant attachment to ornaments of this sort, forms the first stage towards the corruption of taste.

The next figure concerning which we are to treat, is called HYPERBOLE or EXAGGERATION. It consists in magnifying an object beyond its natural bounds. In all languages, even in common conversation, hyperbolical expressions very frequently occur: as swift as the wind; as white as the snow; and the like; and the common forms of compliment; are almost all of them extravagant hyperboles. If any thing be remarkably good or great in its kind, we are instantly ready to add to it some exaggerating epithet, and to make it the greatest or best we ever saw. The imagination has always a tendency to gratify itself, by magnifying its present object, and carrying it to excess. More or less of this hyperbolical

turn will prevail in language, according to the liveliness of imagination among the people who speak it. Hence young people deal much in hyperboles. Hence the language of the Orientals was far more hyperbolical than that of the Europeans, who are of more phlegmatic, or perhaps we may say, of more correct imagination. Hence, among all writers in early times, and in the rude periods of society, we may expect this figure to abound. Greater experience, and more cultivated society, abate the warmth of imagination, and chasten the manner of expression.

Hyperboles are of two kinds; either such as are employed in description, or such as are suggested by the warmth of passion. All passions without exception, love, terror, amazement, indignation, and even grief, throw the mind into confusion, aggravate their objects, and of course prompt a hyperbolical style. Hence the following sentiments of Satan in Milton, as strongly as they are described, contain nothing but what is natural and proper; exhibiting the picture of a mind agitated with rage and despair.

> Me, miserable! which way shall I fly
> Infinite wrath, and infinite despair?
> Which way I fly is Hell, myself am Hell;
> And in the lowest depth, a lower deep,
> Still threat'ning to devour me, opens wide,
> To which the Hell I suffer seems a Heaven.

The fear of an enemy augments the conceptions of the size of the leader. "I saw their chief," says the scout of Ossian, "tall as a rock of ice; his spear, the blasted fir; his shield, the rising moon: he sat on the shore, like a cloud of mist on the hill."

The errors frequent in the use of Hyperboles, arise either from overstraining, or introducing them on unsuitable occasions. Dryden, in his poem on the Restoration of king Charles the Second, compliments that monarch, at the expense of the sun himself.

> That star that at your birth shone out so bright,
> It stain'd the duller sun's meridian light.

This is indeed mere bombast. It is difficult to ascertain, by any precise rule, the proper measure and boundary of this figure. Good sense and just taste must determine the point, beyond which, if we pass, we become extravagant.

VISION is another figure of speech, which is proper only in animated and warm composition. It is produced when, instead of relating something that is past, we use the present tense, and describe it as actually passing before our eyes. Thus Cicero, in his fourth oration against Catiline: "I seem to myself to behold this city, the ornament of the earth, and the capital of all nations, suddenly involved in one conflagration. I see before me the slaughtered heaps of citizens, lying unburied in the midst of their ruined country. The furious countenance of Cethegus rises to my view, while with a savage joy, he is triumphing in your miseries."

This manner of description supposes a sort of enthusiasm, which carries the person who describes, in some measure out of himself; and, when well executed, must needs, by the force of sympathy, impress the reader or hearer very strongly. But, in order to a successful execution, it requires an uncommonly warm imagination,

and such a happy selection of circumstances, as shall make us think we see before our eyes the scene that is described.

INTERROGATION. The unfigured, literal use of interrogation, is to ask a question: but when men are strongly moved, whatever they would affirm or deny, with great earnestness, they naturally put in the form of a question, expressing thereby the strongest confidence of the truth of their own sentiment, and appealing to their hearers for the impossibility of the contrary. Thus Balaam expressed himself to Balak. "The Lord is not a man that he should lie, neither the son of man that he should repent. Hath he said it? and shall he not do it? Hath he spoken it? and shall he not make it good?"

Interrogation gives life and spirit to discourse. We see this in the animated, introductory speech of Cicero against Catiline: "How long will you, Catiline, abuse our patience? Do you not perceive that your designs are discovered?"—He might indeed have said; "You abuse our patience a long while. You must be sensible, that your designs are discovered." But it is easy to perceive, how much this latter mode of expression, falls short of the force and vehemence of the former.

EXCLAMATIONS are the effect of strong emotions of the mind; such as, surprise, admiration, joy, grief, and the like. "Wo is me that I sojourn in Mesech, that I dwell in the tents of Kedar!" *Psalms.*

"O that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night, for the slain of the daughter of my people! O that I had

in the wilderness a lodging-place of way-faring men!" *Jeremiah.*

Though Interrogations may be introduced into close and earnest reasoning, exclamations belong only to strong emotions of the mind. When judiciously employed, they agitate the hearer or the reader with similar passions: but it is extremely improper, and sometimes ridiculous, to use them on trivial occasions, and on mean or low subjects. The unexperienced writer often attempts to elevate his language, by the copious display of this figure: but he rarely or never succeeds. He frequently renders his composition frigid to excess, or absolutely ludicrous, by calling on us to enter into his transports, when nothing is said or done to demand emotion.

IRONY is expressing ourselves in a manner contrary to our thoughts; not with a view to deceive, but to add force to our observations. Persons may be reproved for their negligence, by saying; "You have taken great care indeed." Cicero says of the person against whom he was pleading; "We have great reason to believe that the modest man would not ask him for his debt, when he pursues his life."

Ironical exhortation is a very agreeable kind of figure; which after having set the inconveniences of a thing, in the clearest light, concludes with a feigned encouragement to pursue it. Such is that of Horace, when, having beautifully described the noise and tumults of Rome, he adds ironically;

"Go now, and study tuneful verse at Rome."

The subjects of Irony are vices and follies of all kinds: and this mode of exposing them, is often more effectual

than serious reasoning. The gravest persons have not declined the use of this figure, on proper occasions. The wise and virtuous Socrates made great use of it, in his endeavours to discountenance vicious and foolish practices. Even in the sacred writings, we have a remarkable instance of it. The prophet Elijah, when he challenged the priests of Baal to prove the truth of their deity, "Mocked them, and said: Cry aloud, for he is a god: either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be waked."

Exclamations and Irony are sometimes united: as in Cicero's oration for Balbus, where he derides his accuser, by saying; "O excellent interpreter of the law! master of antiquity! corrector and amender of our constitution!"

The last figure of speech that we shall mention, is what writers call AMPLIFICATION or CLIMAX. It consists in heightening all the circumstances of an object or action, which we desire to place in a strong light. Cicero gives a lively instance of this figure, when he says; "It is a crime to put a Roman citizen in bonds; it is the height of guilt to scourge him; little less than parricide to put him to death: what name then shall I give to the act of crucifying him?"

Archbishop Tillotson uses this figure very happily, to recommend good and virtuous actions: "After we have practised good actions a while, they become easy; and when they are easy, we begin to take pleasure in them; and when they please us, we do them frequently; and by frequency of acts, a thing grows into a habit; and con-

firmed habit is a kind of second nature; and so far as any thing is natural, so far it is necessary; and we can hardly do otherwise; nay, we do it many times when we do not think of it."

The following is an example of a beautiful climax, taken from the charge of a judge to the jury, in the case of a woman accused of murdering her own child.—"Gentlemen, if one man had any how slain another; if an adversary had killed his opposer, or a woman occasioned the death of her enemy; even these criminals would have been capitally punished by the Cornelian law: but if this guiltless infant, that could make no enemy, had been murdered by its own nurse, what punishment would not then the mother have demanded? With what cries and exclamations would she have stunned your ears! What shall we say then, when a woman, guilty of homicide, a mother, of the murder of her innocent child, hath comprised all those misdeeds in one single crime? a crime, in its own nature, detestable; in a woman, prodigious; in a mother, incredible; and perpetrated against one whose age called for compassion, whose near relation claimed affection, and whose innocence deserved the highest favour."

Amplification is produced by various methods: by ascending from particular to general things; by descending from generals to particulars; by an enumeration of parts; by illustrating a thing from a variety of causes; by exhibiting a number and variety of effects; by gradation; by the circumstances of time, place, manner, event, and the like; and by elucidating things by their opposites.

The blessings and advantages of peace, may be recommended from their opposites, the miseries and

calamities of war. Thus Cicero endeavours to throw contempt upon Catiline and his party, by comparing them with the contrary side, as follows.—" But if omitting all these things, with which we abound, and which they want, the senate, the knights, the populace, the city, treasury, revenues, all Italy, the provinces, and foreign nations; if, I say, omitting these things, we compare the causes themselves, in which each side is engaged, we may learn from thence how despicable they are. For on this side modesty is engaged, on that impudence; on this chastity, on that lewdness; on this integrity, on that fraud; on this piety, on that profaneness; on this constancy, on that fickleness; on this honour, on that baseness; on this moderation, on that unbridled passion; in a word, equity, temperance, fortitude, prudence, and all virtues, contend with injustice, luxury, cowardice, rashness, and all vices; plenty with want, reason with folly, sobriety with madness, and lastly good hope with despair. In such a contest, did men desert us, would not Heaven ordain, that so many and so great vices, should be defeated by these most excellent virtues?"

As different figures of speech are often blended in the same passage, so the reader will perceive, that, in the preceding extract, the figure of Amplification comprises that of Antithesis.

We have now finished what was proposed, concerning Perspicuity in single words and phrases, and the accurate construction of sentences. The former has been considered, under the heads of Purity, Propriety, and Precision; and the latter, under those of Clearness, Unity, Strength, and the proper use of Figurative Language. Though many of those attentions which have been recom-

mended, may appear minute, yet their effect upon writing and style, is much greater than might, at first, be imagined. A sentiment which is expressed in accurate language, and in a period, clearly, neatly, and well arranged, always makes a stronger impression on the mind, than one that is expressed inaccurately, or in a feeble or embarrassed manner. Every one feels this upon a comparison: and if the effect be sensible in one sentence, how much more in a whole discourse, or composition that is made up of such sentences?

The fundamental rule for writing with accuracy, and into which all others might be resolved, undoubtedly is, *to communicate, in correct language, and in the clearest and most natural order, the ideas which we mean to transfuse into the minds of others.* Such a selection and arrangement of words, as do most justice to the sense, and express it to most advantage, make an agreeable and strong impression. To these points have tended all the rules which have been given. Did we always think clearly, and were we, at the same time, fully masters of the language in which we write, there would be occasion for few rules. Our sentences would then, of course, acquire all those properties of clearness, unity, strength, and accuracy, which have been recommended. For we may rest assured, that whenever we express ourselves ill, besides the mismanagement of language, there is, for the most part, some mistake in our manner of conceiving the subject. Embarrassed, obscure, and feeble sentences, are generally, if not always, the result of embarrassed, obscure, and feeble thought. Thought and expression act and re-act upon each other. The understanding and language have a strict connexion; and they who are learning to compose and arrange their sentences with accuracy and order, are learning, at the same time, to

think with accuracy and order; a consideration which *alone* will recompense the student, for his attention to this branch of literature.

We now proceed to consider the Third Part of our subject, namely, the great principle or standard, by which the propriety of language is ascertained and determined.

PART III.

Of Perspicuity and Accuracy of Expression,

With respect to the Great Principle, which, on all occasions, decides the propriety of language.

AMIDST the diversity and fluctuation of sentiment, respecting the correctness of language and the true idiom of our tongue, which are so frequently found to prevail amongst writers and critics, the student will naturally wish to be directed to some authority and standard, by which his doubts may, on most if not all occasions, be removed, and the propriety of his literary compositions ascertained. This principle or standard, is *reputable*, *national*, and *present* use.

In the course of our grammatical labours, we have occasionally referred, or alluded, to this standard: but the nature and importance of it require a more extensive and particular examination. A proper view of the subject involves, indeed, much critical discussion, and many necessary cautions, rules, and distinctions. But though the execution of such a work, is a delicate and arduous task, it has been happily accomplished by the learned and ingenious Doctor Campbell, in his "Philosophy of Rhetoric." We shall therefore, availing ourselves of his labours, produce a copious extract (with some additions and alterations) from what he has written on the subject; which we hope will afford the ingenious student complete satisfaction.

CHAPTER I.

The nature and characters of the use which gives law to language.

Every tongue whatever is founded in use or custom,

.... "Whose arbitrary sway
Words and the forms of language must obey."* FRANCIS.

Language is purely a species of fashion, (for this holds equally of every tongue,) in which, by the general, but tacit consent of the people of a particular state or country, certain sounds come to be appropriated to certain things, as their signs; and certain ways of inflecting and combining those sounds come to be established, as denoting the relations which subsist among the things signified.

It is not the business of grammar, as some critics seem preposterously to imagine, to give law to the fashions which regulate our speech. On the contrary, from its conformity to these, and from that alone, it derives all its authority and value. For, what is the grammar of any language? It is no other than a collection of general observations methodically digested, and comprising all the modes previously and independently established, by which the significations, derivations, and combinations of words in that language, are ascertained. It is of no consequence here to what causes originally these modes or fashions owe their existence; whether to imitation, or reflection, to affectation, or to caprice: they no sooner obtain and become general, than they are laws of the language, and the grammarian's only business is, to note, collect, and

* .... "Usus
Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi." HORACE.

methodise them.* Nor does this truth concern only those more comprehensive analogies or rules, which affect whole classes of words; such as nouns, verbs, and the other parts of speech; but it concerns every individual word, in the inflecting or the combining of which, a particular mode has prevailed. Every single anomaly, therefore, though departing from the rule assigned to the other words of the same class, and on that account called an exception, stands on the same basis, on which the rules of the tongue are founded, custom having prescribed for it a separate rule.—If use be here a matter of such consequence, it will be necessary, before advancing any farther, to ascertain precisely, what it is. We shall otherwise be in danger, though we agree about the name, of differing widely in the notion that we assign to it.

Section 1.

Of reputable use.

In what extent then must the term be understood? It is sometimes called general use; yet is it not manifest, that the generality of people speak and write very badly? Nay, is not this a truth that will be even generally acknowledged? It will be so; and this very acknowledgment shows, that many terms and idioms may be common, which, nevertheless, have not the general sanction; no, nor even the suffrage of those that use them. The use here spoken of, implies not only *currency*, but *vogue*. It is properly *reputable custom*.

This leads to a distinction between good use, and bad use in language, the former of which will be found to have the approbation of those who have not themselves

---

* It is scarcely necessary to observe, that, with the moral misapplication of words and phrases, this work has not any concern. No usage whatever can justify such perversions of language.

attained it. The far greater part of mankind, perhaps ninety-nine of a hundred, are, by reason of poverty and other circumstances, deprived of the advantages of education, and obliged to toil for bread, almost incessantly, in some narrow occupation. They have neither the leisure nor the means of attaining scarcely any knowledge, except what lies within the contracted circle of their several professions. As the ideas which occupy their minds are few, the portion of the language known to them must be very scanty. It is impossible that our knowledge of words should outstrip our knowledge of things. It may, and often does, come short of it. Words may be remembered as sounds, but cannot be understood as signs, whilst we remain unacquainted with the things signified.

From the practice of those who are conversant in any art, elegant or mechanical, we may always take the sense of the terms and phrases belonging to that art: in like manner, from the practice of those who have had a liberal education, and are therefore presumed to be best acquainted with men and things, we judge of the general use in language. If, in this particular, there be any deference to the practice of the great and rich, it is not ultimately because they are greater and richer than others; but because, from their greatness and riches, they are imagined to be wiser and more knowing. The source, therefore, of that preference which distinguishes good use from bad in language, is a natural propension of the human mind to believe, that those are the best judges of the proper signs, and of the proper application of them, who understand best the things which they represent.

But who are they, that in the public estimation are possessed of this character? This question is of the greatest moment for ascertaining that use, which is entitled to the epithets reputable and good. Vangelas makes them in France to be, "the soundest part of the court, and the soundest part of the authors of the age."—With us

Britons, the first part, at least, of this description, will not answer. Use in language requires firmer ground to stand upon. No doubt, the conversation of men of rank and eminence, whether of the court or not, will have its influence. And in what concerns merely the pronunciation, it is the only rule to which we can refer the matter, in every doubtful case: but in what concerns the words themselves, their construction and application, it is of importance to have some certain, steady, and well-known standard to recur to, a standard which every one has access to canvas and examine. And this can be no other than authors of reputation. Accordingly we find that these are, by universal consent, in actual possession of this authority; as, to this tribunal, when any doubt arises, the appeal is always made.

I choose to name them, authors of reputation, rather than good authors, for two reasons: first, because it is more strictly conformable to the truth of the case. It is solely the esteem of the public, and not their intrinsic merit, (though these two go generally together,) which raises them to this distinction, and stamps a value on their language. Secondly, this character is more definitive than the other, and therefore more extensively intelligible. Between two or more authors, different readers will differ exceedingly, as to the preference in point of merit, who agree perfectly as to the respective places they hold in the favour of the public. You may find persons of a taste so particular, as to prefer Parnel to Milton; but you will hardly find a person that will dispute the superiority of the latter in the article of fame. For this reason, I affirm, that Vangelas's definition labours under an essential defect; in as much as it may be difficult to meet with two persons whose judgments entirely coincide, in determining who are the sounder part of the court, or of the authors of the age. I need scarcely add, that when I speak of reputation, I mean not only in regard to

knowledge, but in regard to the talent of communicating knowledge. I could name writers, who, in respect of the first, have been justly valued by the public, but who, on account of a supposed deficiency in respect of the second, are considered as of no authority in language.

Nor is there the least ground to fear, that we should be cramped here within too narrow limits. In the English tongue, there is a plentiful supply of noted writings, in all the various kinds of composition, in prose and verse, serious and ludicrous, grave and familiar. Agreeably then to this first qualification of the term, we must understand to be comprehended under general use, *whatever modes of speech are authorized as good, by the writings of a great number, if not the majority, of celebrated authors.*

Section 2.

Of national use.

Another qualification of the term *use*, which deserves our attention, is, that it must be *national.* This I consider in a two-fold view, as it stands opposed both to *provincial* and to *foreign.*

In every province there are peculiarities of dialect, which affect not only the pronunciation and the accent, but even the inflection and the combination of words, whereby their idiom is distinguished both from that of the nation, and from that of every other province. The narrowness of the circle to which the currency of the words and phrases of such dialects is confined, sufficiently discriminates them from that which is properly styled the language, and which commands a circulation incomparably wider. This is one reason, I imagine, why the term *use*, on this subject, is commonly accompanied with the epithet *general.* In the use of provincial idioms, there is, it must be acknowledged, a pretty considerable con-

currence both of the middle and of the lower ranks. But still this use is bounded by the province, county, or district, which gives name to the dialect, and beyond which its peculiarities are sometimes unintelligible, and often ridiculous. But the language, properly so called, is found current, especially in the upper and the middle ranks, over the whole British empire. Thus, though in every province, they frequently ridicule the idioms of every other province, they all vail to the English idiom, and scruple not to acknowledge its superiority over their own.

What has now been said of provincial dialects, may, with very little variation, be applied to professional dialects, or the cant which is sometimes observed to prevail among those of the same profession or way of life. The currency of the latter cannot be so exactly circumscribed as that of the former, whose distinction is purely local; but their use is not on that account either more extensive or more reputable.

It was remarked, that national might also be opposed to foreign. I imagine it is too evident to need illustration, that the introduction of extraneous words and idioms, from other languages and foreign nations, cannot be a smaller transgression against the established custom of the English tongue, than the introduction of words and idioms peculiar to some precincts of England, or at least somewhere current within the British pale. The only material difference between them is, that the one is more commonly the error of the learned, the other of the vulgar. But if, in this view, the former is entitled to greater indulgence, from the respect paid to learning; in another view, it is entitled to less, as it is much more commonly the result of affectation.—Thus two essential qualities of usage, in regard to language, have been settled, that it be both *reputable* and *national*.

Section 3.

Of present use.

But there will naturally arise here another question; "Is not use, even good and national use, in the same country, different in different periods? and if so, to the usage of what period shall we attach ourselves, as the proper rule? If you say, *the present*, as it may reasonably be expected that you will, the difficulty is not entirely removed. In what extent of signification must we understand the word *present?* How far may we safely range in quest of authorities? or, at what distance backwards from this moment are authors still to be accounted as possessing a legislative voice in language?" To this, I own, it is difficult to give an answer with all the precision that might be desired. Yet it is certain, that when we are in search of precedents for any word or idiom, there are certain mounds which we cannot overleap with safety. For instance, the authority of Hooker or Raleigh, however great their merit and their fame be, will not be admitted in support of a term or expression, not to be found in any good writer of a later date.

In truth, the boundary must not be fixed at the same distance, in every subject. Poetry has ever been allowed a wider range than prose; and it is but just that, by an indulgence of this kind, some compensation should be made for the peculiar restraints she is laid under by the measure. Nor is this only a matter of convenience to the poet, it is also a source of gratification to the reader. Diversity in the style relieves the ear, and prevents its being tired with the too frequent recurrence of the rhymes, or sameness of the metre. But still there are limits to this diversity. The authority of Milton and of Waller, on this article, remains as yet unquestioned.

I should not think it prudent often to introduce words or phrases, of which no example could be produced since the days of Spencer.

And even in prose, the bounds are not the same for every kind of composition. In matters of science, for instance, whose terms, from the nature of the thing, are not capable of such a currency as those which belong to ordinary subjects, and are within the reach of ordinary readers, there is no necessity of confining an author within a very narrow circle. But in composing pieces which come under this last denomination, as history, biography, travels, moral essays, familiar letters, and the like, it is safest for an author to consider those words and idioms as obsolete, which have been disused by all good authors, for a longer period than the age of man extends to. It is not by ancient, but by present use, that our style must be regulated. And that use can never be denominated present, which has been laid aside time immemorial, or, which amounts to the same thing, falls not within the knowledge or remembrance of any now living.

This remark not only affects terms and phrases, but also the declension, combination, and construction of words. Is it not then surprising to find, that one of Dr. Lowth's penetration, should think a single person entitled to revive a form of inflection in a particular word, which had been rejected by all good writers, of every denomination, for more than a hundred and fifty years?* But if present use is to be renounced for ancient, it will be necessary to determine at what precise period antiquity is to be regarded as a rule. One inclines to remove the standard to the distance of a century and a half; another may, with as good reason, fix it three centuries backwards,

* In a note on the irregular verb *sit*, he says, "Dr. Middleton hath, with great propriety, restored the true participle *sitten*."

and another six. And if the language of any of these periods is to be judged by the use of any other, it will be found, no doubt, entirely barbarous. To me it is so evident, either that the present use must be the standard of the present language, or that the language admits no standard whatever, that I cannot conceive a clearer and more indisputable principle, from which to bring an argument to support it.

Yet it is certain, that even some of our best critics and grammarians, talk occasionally, as if they had a notion of some other standard, though they never give us a single hint to direct us where to search for it. Doctor Johnson, for example, in the preface to his very valuable Dictionary, acknowledges properly the absolute dominion of custom over language; and yet, in the explanation of particular words, expresses himself sometimes, in a manner that is inconsistent with this doctrine; "This word," says he in one place, "though common, and used by the best writers, is perhaps barbarous." I entirely agree with Doctor Priestley, that it will never be the arbitrary rules of any man, or body of men whatever, that will ascertain the language, there being no other dictator here than use.

It is indeed easier to discover the aim of our critics, in their observations on this subject, than the meaning of the terms which they employ; these are often used without precision; their aim, however, is generally good. It is, as much as possible, to give a check to innovation. But the means which they use for this purpose, have sometimes even a contrary tendency. If you will replace what has been long since expunged from the language, and extirpate what is firmly rooted, undoubtedly you yourself become an innovator. If you desert the present use, and by your example, at least, establish it as a maxim, that every critic may revive at pleasure old-fashioned

terms, inflections, and combinations, and make such alterations on words as will bring them nearer to what he supposes to be the etymon, there can be nothing fixed or stable on the subject. Possibly you prefer the usage that prevailed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; another may, with as good reason, have a partiality for that which subsisted in the days of Chaucer. And with regard to etymology, about which grammarians make so much useless bustle; if every one has a privilege of altering words, according to his own opinion of their origin, the opinions of the learned being on this subject so various, nothing but a general chaos can ensue.

On the other hand, it may be said, "Are we to catch at every new-fashioned term and phrase, which whim or affectation may invent, and folly circulate? Can this ever tend to give either dignity to our style, or permanency to our language?"—It cannot surely.

If we recur to the standard already assigned, namely, the writings of a plurality of celebrated authors, there will be no scope for the comprehension of words and idioms, which can be denominated novel and upstart. It must be owned, that we often meet with such terms and phrases, in newspapers, periodical pieces, and political pamphlets. The writers to the times, rarely fail to have their performances studded with a competent number of these fantastic ornaments. A popular orator in the House of Commons, has a sort of patent from the public, during the continuance of his popularity, for coining as many as he pleases. And they are no sooner issued, than they obtrude themselves upon us from every quarter, in all the daily papers, letters, essays, addresses, &c. But this is of no significancy. Such words and phrases are but the insects of a season, at the most. The people, always fickle, are just as prompt to drop them, as they were to take them up; and not one of a hundred survives the particular occasion or party-

struggle which gave it birth. We may justly apply to them, what Johnson says of a great number of the terms of the laborious and mercantile part of the people; "This fugitive cant cannot be regarded as any part of the durable materials of a language; and therefore must be suffered to perish, with other things unworthy of preservation."

As use, therefore, implies duration, and as even a few years are not sufficient for ascertaining the characters of authors, I have, for the most part, in the following sheets, taken my prose examples, neither from living authors, nor from those who wrote before the Revolution; not from the first, because an author's fame is not so firmly established in his lifetime; nor from the last, that there may be no suspicion that the style is superannuated. The present translation of the Bible, I must indeed except from this restriction. The continuance and universality of its use, throughout the British dominions, afford an obvious reason for the exception *.

Thus I have attempted to explain, what that *use* is, which is the sole mistress of language; and to ascertain the precise import and extent of these her essential attributes, *reputable*, *national*, and *present*; and to give the directions proper to be observed in searching for the laws of this empress. In truth, grammar and criticism are but her ministers; and though, like other ministers, they would sometimes impose the dictates of their own humour upon the people, as the commands of their sovereign, they are not so often successful in such attempts, as to encourage the frequent repetition of them.

---

* The vulgar translation of the Bible (says Dr. Lowth) is the best standard of our language.

CHAPTER II.

The nature and use of verbal Criticism, with its principal canons.

It may be alleged by some persons, that "if custom, which is so capricious and unaccountable, is every thing in language, of what significance is either the grammarian or the critic?"—Of considerable significance notwithstanding; and of most then when they confine themselves to their legal departments, and do not usurp an authority that does not belong to them. The man who, in a country like ours, should compile a succinct, perspicuous, and faithful digest of the laws, though no lawgiver, would be universally acknowledged to be a public benefactor. How easy would that important branch of knowledge be rendered by such a work, in comparison of what it must be, when we have nothing to have recourse to, but a labyrinth of statutes, reports, and opinions. That man also would be of considerable use, though not in the same degree, who should vigilantly attend to every illegal practice that was beginning to prevail, and evince its danger, by exposing its contrariety to law. Of similar benefit, though in a different sphere, are grammar and criticism. In language, the grammarian is properly the compiler of the digest; and the verbal critic, the man who seasonably notifies the abuses that are creeping in. Both tend to facilitate the study of the tongue to strangers, and to render natives more perfect in the knowledge of it; to advance general use into universal; and to give a greater stability, at least, if not permanency, to custom, the most mutable thing in nature. These are advantages which, with a moderate share of attention, may be discovered, from what has been already said on the subject; but

they are not the only advantages. From what I shall have occasion to observe afterwards, it will probably appear, that these arts, by assisting to suppress every unlicensed term, and to stigmatize every improper idiom, tend to give greater precision, and consequently more perspicuity and beauty, to our style.

The observations made in the preceding chapter, might easily be converted into so many canons of criticism; by which, whatever is repugnant to reputable, to national, or to present use, in the sense wherein these epithets have been explained, would be condemned as a transgression of the radical laws of the language. But on this subject of use, there arise two eminent questions, the determination of which may lead to the establishment of other canons, not less important. The first question is this; Is reputable, national, and present use, which, for brevity's sake, I shall hereafter simply denominate good use, always uniform in her decisions? The second is; As no term, idiom, or application, that is totally unsupported by her, can be admitted to be good, is every term, idiom, and application, that is countenanced by her, to be esteemed good, and therefore worthy to be retained?

Section 1.

Good use not always uniform in her decisions.

In answer to the former of these questions, I acknowledge, that, in every case, there is not a perfect uniformity in the determinations, even of such use as may justly be denominated good. Wherever a considerable number of authorities can be produced, in support of two different, though resembling modes of expression for the same thing, there is always a divided use, and one cannot be said to speak barbarously, or to oppose the

usage of the language, who conforms to either side. This divided use has place sometimes in construction, and sometimes in arrangement. In all such cases there is scope for choice; and it belongs, without question, to the critical art, to lay down the principles, by which, in doubtful cases, our choice should be directed.—The following canons are humbly proposed, in order to assist us in assigning the preference. Let it, in the meantime be remembered, as a point always presupposed, that the authorities on the opposite sides, are equal, or nearly so. When those of one side greatly preponderate, it is in vain to oppose the prevailing usage. Custom, when wavering, may be swayed, but, when reluctant, will not be forced. And in this department a person never effects so little, as when he attempts too much.

Canon the first.

When use is divided as to any particular words or phrases, and when one of the expressions is susceptible of a different signification, whilst the other never admits but one sense; both perspicuity and variety require, that the form of expression, which is, in every instance, strictly univocal, should be preferred.

For this reason *aught*, signifying any thing, is preferable to *ought*, which is one of our defective verbs. In the preposition *toward* and *towards*, and the adverbs *forward* and *forwards*, *scarce* and *scarcely*, *backward* and *backwards*, the two forms are used indiscriminately. But as the first form in all these is also an adjective, it is better to confine the particles to the second.

The following pertinent illustrations of the first canon, are taken from Dr. Crombie. To *purpose*, for, "to intend," is better than to *propose*, which signifies also "to lay before," or "submit to consideration:" and *proposal*, for "a thing offered or proposed," is better

than "proposition," which denotes also "a position," or "the affirmation of any principle or maxim." Thus we say, "He demonstrated Euclid's *proposition*:" and, "He rejected the *proposal* of his friend."—"I am mistaken," is frequently used to denote, "I misunderstand," or "I am in error;" but as this expression may also signify, "I am misunderstood," it is better to say, "I mistake."

Canon the second.

In doubtful cases, regard ought to be had in our decisions to the analogy of the language.

For this reason, I prefer contemporary to cotemporary. The general use, in words compounded with the syllable *con*, is to retain the *n* before a consonant, and to expunge it before a vowel or an *h* mute. Thus we say, concurrence, conjuncture, concomitant; but co-equal, co-eternal, co-inside, co-heir.—If, by the former canon, the adverbs *backwards* and *forwards*, are preferable to *backward* and *forward;* by this canon, from the principle of analogy, *afterwards* and *homewards* should be preferred to *afterward* and *homeward.*—The phrase, "though he were *ever so* good," is preferable to, "though he were *never so* good." In this decision, I subscribe to the judgment of Dr. Johnson.—Sometimes *whether* is followed by *no*, sometimes by *not.* For instance, some would say, "*Whether* he will or *no*;" others, "*Whether* he will or *not.*" Of these it is the latter only that is analogical. There is an ellipsis of the verb in the last clause, which when you supply, you find it necessary to use the adverb *not;* "*Whether* he will *or* will *not.*"

Canon the third.

When the terms or expressions are in other respects equal, that ought to be preferred which is most agreeable

to the ear.—Of this we have many examples. *Delicateness* has very properly given way to *delicacy;* and for a like reason *authenticity* will probably soon displace *authenticalness,* and *vindictive* disposess *vindicative* altogether.

Canon the fourth.

In cases wherein none of the foregoing rules gives either side a ground of preference, a regard to simplicity, (in which I include etymology when manifest,) ought to determine our choice.

Under the name simplicity, I must be understood to comprehend also brevity; for that expression is always the simplest which, with equal purity and perspicuity, is the briefest. We have, for instance, several active verbs, which are used either with or without a preposition indiscriminately. Thus we say, either *accept* or *accept of, admit* or *admit of, approve* or *approve of;* in like manner, *address* or *address to, attain* or *attain to.* In such instances it will hold, I suppose, pretty generally, that the simple form is preferable.

SECTION 2.

Every thing favoured by good use, not on that account worthy to be retained.

I COME now to the second question for ascertaining both the extent of the authority claimed by custom, and the rightful prerogatives of criticism. As no term, idiom, or application, that is totally unsupported by use, can be admitted to be good; is every term, idiom, and application, that is countenanced by use, to be esteemed good, and therefore worthy to be retained?—I answer, that though nothing in language can be good, from which use withholds her approbation, there may be many things

to which she gives it, that are not in all respects good, or such as are worthy to be retained and imitated. In some instances, *custom* may very properly be checked by *criticism*, which has a sort of negative, and though not the censorian power of instant degradation, the privilege of remonstrating, and by means of this, when used discreetly, of bringing what is bad into disrepute, and so cancelling it gradually; but which has no positive right to establish any thing.—I shall therefore subjoin a few remarks, under the form of canons, in relation to those words or expressions, which may be thought to merit degradation from the rank they have hitherto maintained; submitting these remarks entirely, as every thing of the kind must be submitted, to the final determination of the impartial public.

Canon the first.

All words and phrases which are remarkably harsh and unharmonious, and not absolutely necessary, should be rejected.—Such are the words, *un-success-ful-ness, dis-interest-ed-ness; conventiclers, peremptorily; holily, farriering.* They are heavy and drawling, ill compacted, and difficult of utterance; and they have nothing to compensate for their defect of harmony, and unpleasantness of sound.

Canon the second.

When etymology *plainly* points to a signification different from that which the word commonly bears, propriety and simplicity both require its dismission.—Of this kind is the word *beholden*, for obliged or indebted. It should regularly be the passive participle of the verb *to behold*, which would convey a sense totally different. The verb *to unloose*, should analogically signify *to tie*, in like manner as *to untie* signifies *to loose*. To what

purpose is it, then, to retain a term, without any necessity, in a signification the reverse of that which its etymology *manifestly* suggests?

Canon the third.

When any words become obsolete, or at least are never used, except as constituting part of particular phrases, it is better to dispense with their service entirely, and give up the phrases.—Examples of this we have in the words *lief*, *dint*, *whit*, *moot*, *pro*, and *con;* as, "*I had as lief* go myself," for "I should like as well to go myself." "He convinced his antagonist *by dint of argument*," that is, "by strength of argument." "He made them yield *by dint of arms*,"—"by force of arms." "He is *not a whit better*,"—"no better." "The case you mention is *a moot point*,"—"a disputable point." "The question was strenuously debated *pro and con*,"—"on both sides." These are low phraseologies; and savour so much of cant, that good writers will carefully avoid them.

Canon the fourth.

All those phrases, which, when analyzed grammatically, include a solecism; and all those to which use has affixed a particular sense, but which, when explained by the general and established rules of the language, are susceptible either of a different sense, or of no sense, ought to be discarded altogether.

It is this kind of phraseology which is distinguished by the epithet *idiomatical*, and which has been originally the spawn, partly of ignorance, and partly of affectation. Of the first sort, which includes a solecism, is the phrase, "I *had* rather *do* such a thing," for, "I would rather do it." "*I had do*," is a gross violation of the rules of conjugation in our language.—Of the second sort, which,

when explained grammatically, leads to a different sense from what the words in conjunction generally bear, is, the following expression, common in the mouths of many persons; "He sings a good song." The words strictly considered, signify, that "the song is good;" whereas the speakers' meaning is, that "He sings well."—Under the third sort, which can scarcely be considered as literally conveying any sense, may be ranked a number of vile, but common phrases, sometimes to be found in good authors; like *shooting at rovers*, *having a month's mind*, *currying favour*, *dancing attendance*, and many others.

So much for the canons of verbal criticism, which properly succeed the characters of good use, proposed in the preceding chapter, for the detection of the most flagrant errors in the choice, the construction, and the application of words. The first four of these canons are intended to suggest the principles by which our choice ought to be directed, in cases wherein use itself is wavering; and the last four, to point out those farther improvements, which the critical art, without exceeding her legal powers, may assist in producing. There are, indeed, writers who seem disposed to extend her authority much further. But we ought always to remember, that as the principal mode of improving a language, which she is empowered to employ, is by condemning and exploding, there is considerable danger, lest she carry her improvements this way too far. Our mother-tongue, by being too much impaired, may be impoverished; and so more injured in copiousness and nerves, than all our refinements will ever be able to compensate. For this reason there ought, in support of every sentence of proscription, to be an evident plea from the principles of perspicuity, elegance, or harmony.

ADDRESS

TO YOUNG STUDENTS.*

The Compiler of these elements of the English language, takes the liberty of presenting to you a short address. He presumes it will be found to comport entirely with the nature and design of his work; and he hopes it will not be unacceptable to you. It respects your future walks in the paths of literature; the chief purpose to which you should apply your acquisitions; and the true sources of your present and future happiness.

In forming this Grammar, and the volume of Illustrations connected with it, the author was influenced by a desire to facilitate your progress in learning, and, at the same time, to impress on your minds principles of piety and virtue. He wished also to assist, in some degree, the labours of those who are cultivating your understandings, and providing for you a fund of rational and useful employment; an employment calculated to exclude those frivolous pursuits, and that love of ease and sensual pleasure, which enfeeble and

* To those who are engaged in the study of this Grammar.

corrupt the minds of many inconsiderate youth, and render them useless to society.

Without your own best exertions, the concern of others for your welfare, will be of little avail; with them, you may fairly promise yourselves success. The writer of this address, therefore, recommends to you, an earnest co-operation with the endeavours of your friends, to promote your improvement and happiness. This co-operation, whilst it secures your own progress, will afford you the heart-felt satisfaction of knowing that you are cherishing the hopes, and augmenting the pleasures, of those with whom you are connected by the most endearing ties. He recommends to you also, serious and elevated views of the studies in which you may be engaged. Whatever may be your attainments, never allow yourselves to rest satisfied with mere literary acquisitions, nor with a selfish or contracted application of them. When they advance only the interests of this stage of being, and look not beyond the present transient scene, their influence is circumscribed within a very narrow sphere. The great business of this life is to prepare, and qualify us, for the enjoyment of a better, by cultivating a pure and humble state of mind, and cherishing habits of piety towards God, and benevolence to men.—Every thing that promotes or retards this important work, is of great moment to you, and claims your first and most serious attention.

If, then, the cultivation of letters, and an advancement in knowledge, are found to strengthen and en-

large your minds, to purify and exalt your pleasures, and to dispose you to pious and virtuous sentiments and conduct, they produce excellent effects; which, with your best endeavours to improve them, and the Divine blessing superadded, will not fail to render you, not only wise and good yourselves, but also the happy instruments of diffusing wisdom, religion, and goodness around you. Thus improved, your acquisitions become handmaids to virtue; and they may eventually serve to increase the rewards, which the Supreme Being has promised to faithful and well-directed exertions, for the promotion of truth and goodness amongst men.

But if you counteract the hopes of your friends, and the tendency of these attainments; if you grow vain of your real or imaginary distinctions, and regard with contempt, the virtuous, unlettered mind; if you suffer yourselves to be absorbed in over-curious or trifling speculations; if your heart and principles be debased and poisoned, by the influence of corrupting and pernicious books, for which no elegance of composition can make amends; if you spend so much of your time in literary engagements, as to make them interfere with higher occupations, and lead you to forget, that pious and benevolent action is the great end of your being: if such be the unhappy misapplication of your acquisitions and advantages,—instead of becoming a blessing to you, they will prove the occasion of greater condemnation; and, in the hour of serious thought, they may excite the painful reflections,—that it would have been better for you, to have remained illiterate and

unaspiring; to have been confined to the humblest walks of life; and to have been even hewers of wood and drawers of water all your days.

Whilst you contemplate the dangers to which you are exposed, the sorrows and dishonour which accompany talents misapplied, and a course of indolence and folly, may you exert your utmost endeavours to avoid them! Seriously reflecting on the great end for which you were brought into existence; on the bright and encouraging examples of many excellent young persons; and on the mournful deviations of others, who once were promising; may you be so wise as to choose and follow that path, which leads to honour, usefulness, and true enjoyment! This is the morning of your life, in which pursuit is ardent, and obstacles readily give way to vigour and perseverance. Embrace this favourable season; devote yourselves to the acquisition of knowledge and virtue; and humbly pray to God that he may bless your labours. Often reflect on the advantages you possess, and on the source from whence they are all derived. A lively sense of the privileges and blessings, by which you have been distinguished, will induce you to render to your heavenly Father, the just returns of gratitude and love: and these fruits of early piety will be regarded by him as acceptable offerings, and secure to you his favour and protection.

Trusting in the goodness of the Almighty, may you never suffer your minds to be too much depressed with the view of your imperfections

Though our frailties and depravity may be very great, and deeply affecting, yet true repentance towards God; faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; and the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit; are abundantly sufficient to strengthen and purify our hearts, and to render us acceptable to the Father of mercies. And we have the comfortable promise, that He will favourably regard the prayers of his children. Whatever therefore may be your difficulties and discouragements, in resisting the allurements of vice, you may be humbly confident, that Divine assistance will be afforded to all your good and pious resolutions; and that every virtuous effort will have a correspondent reward.

In your pursuits of pleasure and amusement, select those only which are innocent and allowable, and which leave behind them no sorrowful reflections. You may rest assured, that how flattering soever the vain enjoyments of the world may appear, they will finally disappoint the expectations of their votaries; that all the advantages arising from vicious indulgences, are light and contemptible, as well as exceedingly transient, compared with the substantial enjoyments, the present pleasures and the future hopes, which result from piety and virtue. The Holy Scriptures assure us, that "The ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness, and that all her paths are peace:" "that religion has the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come:" and that the truly good man, whatever may be the condition allotted to him by Divine Providence, "in all things gives

thanks, and rejoices even in tribulation." Some of these sentiments have been finely illustrated by a celebrated poet. The author of this address presents the illustration to you, as a striking and beautiful portrait of virtue: with his most cordial wishes, that your hearts and lives may correspond to it; and that your happiness here, may be an earnest of happiness hereafter.

"Know then this truth, (enough for man to know,)
Virtue alone is happiness below:
The only point where human bliss stands still;
And tastes the good, without the fall to ill;
Where only merit constant pay receives,
Is bless'd in what it takes, and what it gives;
The joy unequall'd, if its end it gain,
And if it lose, attended with no pain:
Without satiety, though e'er so bless'd;
And but more relish'd as the more distress'd:
The broadest mirth unfeeling folly wears,
Less pleasing far than virtue's very tears:
Good, from each object, from each place acquir'd;
For ever exercis'd, yet never tir'd;
Never elated, while one man's oppress'd;
Never dejected, while another's bless'd:
And where no wants, no wishes can remain;
Since but to wish more virtue, is to gain.—
For him alone hope leads from goal to goal,
And opens still, and opens on his soul;
Till lengthen'd on to faith, and unconfin'd,
It pours the bliss that fills up all the mind."

Pope.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

Thomas Wilson and Sons, Printers, High-Ousegate, York.

MAHARAJA SERFOGI'S SARASVATI MAHAL. THE TANJORE